3 0081 013 344 555

JOINT UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

PR
2937
.R6
v.2

702317

Date Due

Paid.
16 APR 1973
MAY 02 1974

DEMCO NO. 38-298

THE SHAKESPEARE CANON

PART II

By the Same Author

THE SHAKESPEARE CANON : PART I :

I : The Origination of " Henry V."

II : The Origination of " Julius Cæsar."

III : The Authorship of " Richard III."

THE PROBLEM OF " HAMLET."

" HAMLET " ONCE MORE.

CROCE AS SHAKESPEAREAN CRITIC.

SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN : A Thesis of Chapman's Authorship of " A Lover's Complaint," and his origination of " Timon of Athens." With Indications of Further Problems.

THE PROBLEM OF " THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR."

MONTAIGNE AND SHAKESPEARE. Second Edition.

THE BACONIAN HERESY. A Confutation.

ELIZABETHAN LITERATURE.

In Preparation

THE AUTHORSHIP OF " TITUS ANDRONICUS." An Introduction to the Study of the Canon of Shakespeare.

THE
SHAKESPEARE CANON

PART II

I: THE AUTHORSHIP OF "THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA"
II: THE AUTHORSHIP OF "RICHARD II"
III: THE AUTHORSHIP OF "THE COMEDY OF ERRORS"
IV: THE PROBLEM OF "MEASURE FOR MEASURE"

BY

J. M. ROBERTSON

LONDON
GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, LTD.
NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO.
1923

Printed in Great Britain by St. Stephen's Press, Bristol.

JOINT UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
NASHVILLE, TENN.

702317

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE ix

I. THE AUTHORSHIP OF "THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA" 1

I. Doubt and Dogmatism 1
II. A Reasoned Hypothesis 7
III. The Verse Phenomena 11
IV. The Problem Developed 16
V. Greene's Versification 22
VI. Specific Clues to Greene 26
VII. Conclusion 41
Note on Launce 43

II. THE AUTHORSHIP OF "RICHARD II" 45

I. The General Problem 45
II. Un-Shakespearean Aspects 61
III. The Old "Richard II" 66
IV. Our Play an Adaptation 73
V. The Rhymed Matter 77
VI. Marlowe's Rhymed Work 89
Note on Marlowe's Translations 94
VII. Specific Clues to Marlowe 95
VIII. Summary and Conclusion 112

III. THE AUTHORSHIP OF "THE COMEDY OF ERRORS" 126

I. The Problem 126
II. The Versification 130
III. Marlowe and Comedy 134
IV. The Blank-Verse Style 143
V. Specific Clues to Marlowe 149
VI. Summary 155

PAGE

IV. THE PROBLEM OF "MEASURE FOR MEASURE" ... 158

I. The Play as a Whole 158
II. Un-Shakespearean Elements 162
III. Reconstruction or Bad Construction? 166
IV. The Mismanagement of Time 170
V. The Chapman Hypothesis 172
VI. Questions of Manner and Method 177
VII. Points of Style, Substance, and Vocabulary ... 186
VIII. Versification 204
IX. Summary 208

INDEX 213

PREFACE

The reception given by the press to the preceding volume on "The Shakespeare Canon" was so surprisingly tolerant that I have been encouraged by it to publish this second series of investigations, which goes some way to cover the ground of the earlier plays. It was not that any reviewer was so rash as to say the book was in general sound; though one or two bold spirits incurred obloquy by chivalrously endorsing particular propositions—such as the thesis that Marlowe wrote Clarence's Dream. But even the youngest assailant appeared to suspect that the argument as a whole might almost invite a little counter-argument; and this was in one or two instances magnanimously supplied by a demonstration that modern poets have been known to echo Elizabethans; from which it is to be inferred that Elizabethans might sometimes echo each other. As this primary truth had been laboriously illustrated in the assailed volume, it was gratifyingly clear that real progress was being made. By this time, the enterprising students in question, extending their research, may have discovered that Marlowe is unmistakably echoed in TROILUS AND CRESSIDA, besides being quoted in AS YOU LIKE IT. These preliminary but essential truths being taken as established, it seems quite conceivable that discussion may take the bold step of facing the more disturbing issue as to whether there is any describable difference between Shakespeare's style and Marlowe's, to say nothing of Kyd's and Greene's and Peele's and Chapman's.

For continuing to press these unsettling problems the author would sincerely apologise to his conservative countrymen. If he did not do it, the thing might be undertaken in America,[1] though it would perhaps be diffi-

[1] The author feels bound to admit that some forecasts of that kind thrown out by him in 1905 have not been justified. But there has been enough of original work on Shakespeare problems by American critics since 1905 to justify the present proposition.

cult to justify any general suspicion of subversiveness in that quarter. And it is on general grounds desirable that "spring cleaning" should be undertaken within the home. Even in Germany, where conservatism is so faithfully upheld by Professor Brandl, there are signs of new stirrings of critical thought—for instance, there appeared in 1913, before the war, a toilsome doctoral thesis on DIE METRISCHE UNTERSCHEIDE VON SHAKESPEARE'S KING JOHN UND JULIUS CÆSAR, EINE CHRONOLOGISCHE UNTERSUCHUNG von Dr. Anna Kerrl, which was awarded a prize by the Philosophical Faculty of the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität of Bonn. And though patriotism might sternly put aside such interference by the enemy, if it were carried any further, there is no saying how it might affect America. The trouble is that both there and in Germany there is a considerable university machinery of systematic literary research,[1] whereas in England these matters are left to adventurous laymen and to the general press in so far as it may see fit to review their publications.

By way, accordingly, of reassuring those friendly reviewers who, candidly recognising that "there is something in it," humanely and tactfully sought to save him, so to speak, from the mob, the author would suggest that there is really no mob in the case; and that the gay spirits who reach a hilariously hostile conclusion by instantaneous inference from a glance at a sentence in a review may safely be neglected. There are, there must be, others.

These, in turn, doubtless need some encouragement to think for themselves; and on their behalf the author would be so bold as to hint that the Draconic attitude of some of the authorities is a little illusory. The throned belletrist, wont to lay down the law with withering certitude in the newspaper, dismisses all appeals to his critical patience with the verdict that the presumptuous theorist is a mere semi-scientific person who has no conception of poetry, and therefore no right to meddle with

[1] Now, it is to be feared, greatly hampered in Germany by lack of funds and cost of living.

it. To himself the black-capped authority in effect declares: "I may not be scientific; but, thank God, I am poetical." Unluckily he is not, in any adequate sense; and he is poorly endowed with what he piques himself on possessing—vision. He has accustomed himself to identify poetic feeling with sentimentalism; he often lacks perception of the differences between A's versification and B's, between poetry and rhetoric, between falsetto and the true voice, between inspiration and eloquence; even between great eloquence and other sorts; and thus (with Croce) he can find splendid Shakepearean eloquence in such an amalgam of second-rate pre-Shakespearean declamation as TITUS ANDRONICUS. And far better critics than he appear to suppose that any semblance of method in criticism is a proof of lack of taste. Even Professor Herford, one of the ripest of our academics, suggests that anybody interested in economics is to be suspected of incompetence in æsthetics. The present writer cannot bring himself, however, to suppose that his incompetence in mathematics is any gain to him in the study of poetry and poetic styles; or that Professor Herford's distaste for economics is at all conducive to success in discriminating styles in drama. Indeed, if one were to generalise on these matters, one might be tempted—did one not at once remember the work of Professor Bradley and Professor Herford himself—at times to think that the pursuit most unfavourable to fresh æsthetic perception is the academic teaching of literature.

Professor Herford, for instance, described me as "quarrelling with" certain scenes in JULIUS CÆSAR—the scene of Portia's flurry in the street, which he found "charming," and the first scene of Act IV, which he in effect claimed to be useful as explaining why Lepidus does not figure in the rest of the play at all. But the expressions quoted could not convey to any reader the facts (1) that I described the Portia scene as having been inserted with the purpose of impeaching her as a futile meddler in politics, and (2) that I indicated the other scene as clearly belonging originally to a fuller action in

which the dismissal of Lepidus was significant. The point in both cases was that both sections of the play had undergone a re-handling, not that the scenes were bad in themselves. Professor Herford in effect implies that the leisurely Lepidus scene as it stands is quite fitting in an action in which Lepidus never enters, and in which nearly everything else is hurried, curtailed and huddled. But he does not face these counter-considerations, and a reader of his criticism could not realise what the real issue was.

When the ripe professional scholars thus indicate that they "canna be fashed" to work out the problems submitted to them, one can but appeal to open-minded laymen to deal with the issues for themselves. It is surely worth while, for those who see in Shakespeare the prime glory of English literature. That scholarship should become merely a matter of patient exploration of all manner of minor detail in literary history, while great central problems are put aside, is surely a miscarriage in the tasks of culture. The discovery and establishment of the facts about the Shakespeare Canon is surely a matter of the first importance in æsthetics and in culture-history. One learns (from a review) that it has been "felt *on all hands* that the time had come for a volume that should sum up the conclusions of the present moment upon early Chinese pottery." Is it too fanciful to regard Shakespeare as of at least equal interest and importance?

In the present volume, the thesis that RICHARD III is mainly a Marlowe play has been extended to cover RICHARD II. In the former case, there was considerable backing from previous critics, notably Fleay. In the present, there is none from Fleay, though the suggestion of an alien basis had been made long before him; and there is only the common recognition of a "Marlowe influence" to support the thesis of origination of the piece by Marlowe. It is the more certain that the thesis will be resented. I can but urge the open-minded student to consider carefully whether it does not tend to make newly intelligible much of the critical dissatisfaction that has been expressed over the play; and to offer a more satis-

fying as well as a more scientific standpoint than that from which all the faults and feeblenesses are indiscriminately disposed of as due to Shakespeare's youth. There is no pretence that he was appreciably older when he penned KING JOHN, there completely re-writing an old play. Yet there the style is far more Shakespearean than in nine-tenths of RICHARD II, even though it shows a "Marlowe influence."

A newly searching examination of the Marlowe "influence," it is submitted, is urgently required. When one reads with astonishment a criticism in which Marlowe and Shakespeare are bracketed in the lump, as writers of the same school and class, one is immediately led to reflect that while the two RICHARD plays as wholes are regarded as of Shakespeare's planning and writing, that criticism is so far justified. Remove them, with all three HENRY VI plays, to an appendix, as restricted revisions of the work of Marlowe and his group, and such criticism could hardly arise, though there would still be Marlowe matter in the plays.

It is with trepidation, however, that I submit the thesis of Marlowe's origination of the COMEDY OF ERRORS. That is of all our propositions of the kind probably the most certain to be flouted. But on the principle of "In for a penny, in for a pound," I have decided to venture in the present volume to table that proposition also. Perhaps even the spontaneously resentful student will credit my assurance that it was reached not in the least on à priori grounds, but solely by induction from clues which obtruded themselves in the course of study of the versification of the early plays. And natural misgiving dictated long scrutiny before the thesis could take definite shape.

In the conviction that it is really borne out by all the data, it is now offered as part of a revised conception of the work of Marlowe. It is indeed always in respect of inferiority to as well as difference from the genuine work of Shakespeare that Marlowe's is to be disentangled from the Folio; but it is an enterprise of critical justice to make fully clear the innovating service of the short-lived fore-

runner. The framer of such a theory is not likely to expect that critics will "as a stranger give it welcome." He can but plead good faith and painstaking pioneering.

And if the unyielding conservative should bitterly ask, Are we near the end of this? the answer is that haply we are. When we have proposed these ascriptions of the origination of the THE TWO GENTLEMEN, the ERRORS, MEASURE FOR MEASURE, RICHARD II and RICHARD III, HENRY V and JULIUS CÆSAR, with the familiar relegation of the HENRY VI trilogy to pre-Shakespearean hands, and the long-standing recognition of old matter in ROMEO AND JULIET, the idolater has probably heard what he would term "the worst." Further work there will be to do on the Canon—CYMBELINE, for instance, is at points an obtrusive problem; and in the TEMPEST, apart from the primary play indicated by Mr. Dover Wilson as underlying ours, there is some non-Shakespearean matter—but there will probably be little result of a notably subversive kind. It is common ground that some of the chief comedies are probably recasts of older plays. In other cases, as in that of HAMLET, questions of origination raise little risk of conflict as to what is actually Shakespeare's handiwork, however the impressionists may protract the debate on Hamlet's "mystery."

And it is in the faith that all inquiries alike tend to establish ever more clearly the supremacy of Shakespeare over all his "fellows" that those of this series are set forth. If the conservative student can see no ground for suspecting the possibility of any such gain from any critical procedure, he may be fraternally advised to peruse SHAKESPEARE ET LA SUPERSTITION SHAKESPEARIENNE, by M. Georges Pellissier (Hachette, 1914), and discover what answer he can make to some of the charges there brought against the ethic, taste, technique and execution of a quantity of the matter now represented as non-Shakespearean. Often, certainly, M. Pellissier can be shown to be impercipient; often the devotee of a defective dramatic ideal. But often, too, he will be found to be strongly encamped against grades of performance for which mere orthodoxy can make no toler-

able defence. An analysis which finds such material alien to Shakespeare may after all be found comforting.

The rectification of the Canon, however, may be held to create a new scandal inasmuch as it involves a fresh discussion of the part played by Heminge and Condell in the putting-forth of the Folio. In this the tercentenary year of its publication there has been a natural disposition to speak as genially as may be of the men who secured for their race that possession, ill-edited though it was. If we are deliberately to say that the Folio represents as the work of Shakespeare a large number of plays which he only re-handled, some hardly at all, it would seem as if the *bona fides* of the ostensible editors were hopelessly compromised. Professor A. W. Pollard and Mr. J. Dover Wilson, even in the process of proving that the preface misrepresented the facts as to a number of the quartos, are indulgent enough to claim, on an assumption of "the essential integrity of human nature," that even there the editors acted in good faith. But the defence is somewhat thin; and it seems possible to frame, in the very spirit of the defenders, a rather better one. Messrs. Pollard and Wilson expressly and justly insist that the "good" quartos were *not* "stolne and surreptitious copies, maimed and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of injurious impostors that exposed them." Yet the preface signed by Heminge and Condell implicitly and without reserve ascribes that character to *all* the previous issues of the plays. How then is *that* misrepresentation to be reconciled with "the essential integrity of human nature?"

The very desire to vindicate the editors, surely, should move defenders to have regard to the problem of the authorship of the preface. Messrs. Pollard and Wilson, however, surprisingly ignore the question, so long ago raised by Steevens, as to the visible presence of the hand of Ben Jonson in the address "To the great variety of Readers." The case put by Steevens (in the Prolegomena to the Variorum Edition, vol. ii) is so strong that only a very strong counter-argument can entitle criticism to dismiss it; and no such counter-argument is forth-

coming. And if it be replied that the authorship is of no importance seeing that the two players sign their names, it is to be answered that when we regard the preface as penned by Jonson *for* the players it is more easy to understand how it came to contain implications which are untrue.

Jonson, on Steevens's theory, evidently wrote with the genial aim of "helping the sale;" and having only a general knowledge of the existence of spurious quartos, which the players would so characterise, would in careless good faith allude to them without thought of the other quartos, as to which his knowledge might well be quite vague. The main point is that, the preface once written, the players would not venture to alter it. They were under an obligation to Jonson for the composition; and it may even be that he either penned or revised for them the dedication to the "Incomparable Pair of Brothers," which also is a piece of good prose, hardly likely to have been put together by men of no literary preparation. Steevens does not raise that question; and as to the general preface he suggests that Jonson composed only the first paragraph and merely revised the second—this because the latter contains the claim: "We have scarce received from him a blot in his papers," upon which Jonson in his DISCOVERIES has memorably animadverted. But it is quite conceivable that in the friendly mood in which Jonson furthered the issue of the Folio by his commendatory verses he would be willing to pen the players' claim for them, developing only at a later time the carping mood in which he repelled it.

There is reason to suspect that when he wrote the lines for the portrait, extolling that egregious effigy, he had not seen the engraver's plate, which so entirely fails to represent anybody. Yet if he had seen, say, the "Ely" Portrait (original or replica), of which the Droeshout engraving is very probably a skill-less metamorphosis, he may have written his commendatory verses in the same good faith as inspired his plea for the text, which was to give the plays "absolute in their numbers," yet verily did not do so. In sum, the "preliminary matter" for the

Folio was prepared with the genial heedlessness natural to such an undertaking in 1623. Jonson might well take it for granted that *somebody* would read the Folio proofs as he had read his own in 1616—when, however, even he passed some glaring blunders. But players were hardly the men to carry through a task so heavy.

In that connection, too, there is another possible palliation. Mr. A. W. Pollard, Mr. Dover Wilson, and Mr. Compton Rhodes are all agreed that the "copy" for the Folio was supplied by the prompter's copies of the theatre, or, where these were lost, by an "assembling" of actors' parts. But it is extremely improbable that the theatre would in such a wholesale fashion trust either prompter's copies or actors' parts directly to the handling of the printing-houses, where "copy" has to be distributed and is sure to be at best much soiled. The reasonable presumption is that (where printed quartos were not available) the players would have copies for the printers made in MS. from their prompter's copies and actors' parts; and in the course of such copying, on such an extensive scale, there would arise a multitude of new errors of transcription, the checking of which in the MS. would involve an amount of labour that non-literary men would not face. Hence, in the end, a quantity of worse corruption of the text than ever occurred before in "good" quartos. In short, the task of producing a good text of the whole Folio was one to which the editors were not equal. Every author who has had to read the proofs of a big book, set from his own MS., can understand the situation.

When things are seen as having probably happened in this fashion, the ideal of "the essential integrity of human nature" may be held to be sufficiently salved. But beyond this we cannot go. We may pardon the players for obstinately specifying as Shakespeare's works—in order to maintain their hold on the copyrights about which they are so obviously and so naturally anxious—a collection of plays as to which they knew and we know that much of the writing is not Shakespeare's at all. *As to the exact extent of his work on a number*

of the plays they may well have been ignorant. As to the pre-Shakespearean character of nine-tenths of the HENRY VI plays (and, in my opinion, of TITUS ANDRONICUS and yet other plays) they can have been in no doubt, though lapse of time may have dimmed their perceptions. They were not judges of style; and they simply did not see the editorial problem as we see it. Necessarily unable to conceive of such an attitude to the text as has grown up in three centuries of admiring study; unable for themselves even to realise the profound difference between work merely trimmed by Shakespeare and work composed by him, they thought of the plays in the mass as a worthy memorial of their gifted "fellow," and without fraudulent intent left the world to frame what, if challenged, they would have admitted to be a misconception of the history of their documents. There is no occasion, then, to judge harshly of their *bona fides*. They meant to do well alike by the public, the theatre, and their comrade's memory.

But, the critical absolution given, the critical task of eliciting the literary facts must go on. It is Shakespeare's self that we are vindicating, where his well-meaning comrades, giving out the plays at once in the way of business and in the way of friendship, left a grave obstruction to our knowledge of his genius—an obstruction which, one day, may for some stand in the way of appreciation.

To the removal of that obstruction, broadly speaking, the present work is devoted. Happily, there are clear signs of progress. Two days before the entire "copy" of this book is to be placed in the hands of the publishers, I have received from them an advance copy of the work of Mr. William Wells, on "The Authorship of JULIUS CÆSAR." That book has been produced under remarkable circumstances, which at once testify to the abilities of the author and disarm criticism of his oversights. Setting up his book in type with his own hand, with no written copy, "in the intervals between one day's work and another" (p. 159), he never had more type than would suffice for three pages; and every two pages, when

finished, had to be stereotyped. Thus he had actually finished the printing of the bulk of his book (*note* on p. 118), when he met with the first part of mine on THE SHAKESPEARE CANON (which, sent to the publishers in the summer of 1921, did not appear till the early part of 1922). Mr. Wells had thus quite independently reached and developed the view that JULIUS CÆSAR is a play originally drafted by Marlowe. What is no less noteworthy, he has in that connection reached and propounded the theory that RICHARD II was also in origin a Marlowe play. *That* theory, alike independently reached by me in the course of years of investigation, stands developed in the present volume exactly as it stood when Mr. Wells' book reached my hands. Among other grounds for it, the identity of source and nearness of date between Antony's prophecy of coming strife in Italy and the Bishop of Carlisle's prediction of coming strife in England had been posited by both of us.

I may be permitted to congratulate Mr. Wells on the results which, under his difficulties, he has independently reached, while I exhort him, as he will doubtless exhort me, to reconsider parts of his thesis. To the theory of Marlowe's origination of JULIUS CÆSAR he has added the extremely interesting proposition that (Shakespeare having in his opinion only very slightly touched the play) the final reviser was Francis Beaumont. This last (to me) surprising thesis he has supported by an equally surprising amount of internal evidence. Leaving it, for the present, to the close examination which it invites and deserves, I would point out that the reasons for holding that JULIUS CÆSAR is a condensation of two plays (which had been preceded by yet another, on Cæsar and Pompey) have not been weighed by Mr. Wells, and call for his and our consideration. I may add that I simply cannot assent to his proposition (p. 25) that "the very small piece of Shakespeare's work in JULIUS CÆSAR" consists of lines 1 to 57, and ended there. While he holds concerning this section that "none can deny that this is a piece of Shakespeare's work," which he dates about 1608 or 1609, I am strongly of opinion that such

matter cannot have been written by Shakespeare at that time, and much inclined to decide that he never wrote it at all. And I find his hand in later scenes.[1]

Thus does the course of true research, as ever, fail to run smooth. Mr. Wells and I are alike fallible, and should count on having our theories rectified in detail by further research. But it seems to me a noteworthy fact that two investigators, knowing nothing of each other's work, should have reached by similar processes of inference from internal evidence the two-fold conclusion that Marlowe had originated both JULIUS CÆSAR and RICHARD II. In its humble way, if it hold good, it compares with a joint discovery of a star by independently-working astronomers. The fact that my guarded hypothesis of Marlowe's drafting of Antony's Oration, which so many good (and other) critics found exorbitant, had independently forced itself on Mr. Wells, may induce those and yet other critics to give the problem further consideration.

To this hypothesis Mr. Wells partly applies his further important hypothesis of a revision by Beaumont. Should that theory in general be established, it will constitute a signal advance in our knowledge; and I would respectfully invite for it a careful hearing. Whether Mr. Wells and the critics will yield any assent to the further theories concerning Marlowe which are propounded in the present volume, and whether Mr. Wells will reconsider his acceptance of the conventional view that Shakespeare had the largest vocabulary of his day,[2] remains to be seen.

17th June, 1923.

[1] Jonson, it will be remembered, took for granted that Shakespeare originally wrote "Cæsar doth not wrong but with just cause." The fact that in the old TROUBLESOME RAIGNE OF KING JOHN, in what appears to be a Marlowe passage (sc. 1) we have a similar *idea*, leaves open the possibility that Marlowe had drafted the speech of Cæsar; but even there, I think, Shakespeare had intervened.

[2] As to this, see SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN, p. 282 sq.

CORRIGENDA.

P. 22, l. 3; *after* " other " *add* " case."

P. 35, l. 21; *after* " self-echo " *add* "(8)".

P. 124, l. 3; *after* " on " *add* " much."

P. 206, l. 9; *for* " rebelled " *read* " refelled."

I

THE AUTHORSHIP OF "THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA"

I. Doubt and Dogmatism

So long ago as 1743, Sir Thomas Hanmer, ex-Speaker of the House of Commons, inserted in his *édition de luxe* of Shakespeare the note, concerning the Two Gentlemen of Verona, that "it may very well be doubted whether Shakespeare had any other hand in this play than the enlivening it with some speeches and lines thrown in here and there, which are easily distinguished, as being of a different stamp from the rest." A few years later the Rev. John Upton, in his Critical Observations upon Shakespeare (1746), declared concerning both Love's Labour's Lost and the Two Gentlemen, that "if any proof can be formed from manner and style, then should these be sent packing, and seek for their parent elsewhere." Thenceforth there was no judicial investigation of Hanmer's thesis. Upton had killed the inquiry at once by bracketing the Labour with the Gentlemen as spurious, and by setting up fantastic claims for Shakespeare as a classical scholar. The Labour is certainly a questionable play, containing as it does much prose matter that is probably not Shakespeare's, some rhymed matter that is doubtful, and more once-used words than almost any other play in the Canon. But so much of it is clearly Shakespearean that the Variorum men did not even allude to Upton's rejection of it; and the question has not been critically re-opened to this day.

On the question of the classical scholarship of Shakespeare the eighteenth century came to sound views, aided by the scholarly sagacity of Farmer, whose research on that head soon put Upton out of court. Johnson indeed argued the question as to the Two GENTLEMEN, on the irrelevant analogical basis (originals and copies in painting) upon which Upton had put it, and thereby completed the dismissal of the real critical problem. When he had declared for his own part: "I cannot but think that I find, both in the serious and ludicrous scenes, the language and sentiments of Shakespeare," readers contentedly acquiesced. "It is not indeed," he confessed, "one of his most powerful effusions. . . . . But it abounds in γνωμαί beyond most of his plays." Whether the *gnomai* were Shakespearean nobody seems to have dreamt of asking.

Malone, whose exploratory appetite in regard to the Canon seems to have been sated by the discovery that the HENRY VI plays are but partial adaptations, refused to see any such process here, and fulminated: "That it ever should have been a question whether this comedy were the genuine and entire composition of Shakespeare, appears to me very extraordinary." He saw, indeed, "imitation of a preceding celebrated dramatist" in "some of the lower dialogues of this comedy"; but found it all "perfectly Shakespearean," and settled the matter by pronouncing the play "the earliest, or at least one of the earliest," in the Canon. Ritson's was the one outstanding voice independently raised on the other side. By him, Blackstone's suggestion that the "jigging" lines in the ERRORS were the juvenile work of Shakespeare was flatly rejected, and the play classed as merely a partial adaptation; with the HENRY VI plays, the TWO GENTLEMEN, the LABOUR, and RICHARD II, "in all of which pieces Shakespeare's new work is as apparent as the brightest touches of Titian would be on the poorest performance of the veriest canvas-spoiler that ever handled a brush—"[1] a noteworthy anticipation of the prose style of Swinburne.

[1] Cited in Preliminary Remarks to the ERRORS in Var. Ed.

Such blank asseveration, of course, availed nothing towards influencing opinion. The obvious over-emphasis, unsupported by any detail, had the same effect as that of the pronouncement of Upton. Malone, finding that "a strange and whimsical fancy" had been "entertained by various critics," to the effect that his verdict on the HENRY VI plays was applicable to other plays in the Canon, followed up his deliverance on the GENTLEMEN by declaring that (the SHREW being a case of re-writing) TITUS alone could be excluded as the work of another hand. "I do not hesitate to assert," he roundly wrote, "that no such difference in the colour, style and language can be shown in any of the pieces to which my theory concerning the three parts of King Henry the Sixth has been applied." Greatly daring in his orthodoxy, he pronounced Blackstone's notion "extremely apposite and well-founded." Finally he stultified that pronouncement by declaring it to be "extremely probable" that Shakespeare "was furnished with the fable" of the ERRORS "by a play on a similar subject"—to wit, the "Historie of Error," played at Hampton Court on New Year's night 1576-7. This invalidation of the general argument passed unnoticed, and Ritson's verdict on the GENTLEMEN was dismissed with Upton's.

So the matter stood for another century. The good Charles Knight, in his loving expatiation, is not even concerned to notice the heresy of the previous century, and is content to argue against or around every other critic's disparagement of the play, Johnson's included. The American Verplanck (1847) found that the opinion of Hanmer and Upton had been "fully refuted by Johnson, and rejected by all succeeding critics." Grant White (1865) following Malone, found the sceptical verdicts to be "among the many unaccountable and incomprehensible blunders of the critics of the last century"; and affirmed that "so unmistakably does Shakespeare's hand appear in the play, from Valentine's first speech to the last," that it could have been recognised as his if found without his name on the title-page. For this verdict the sole evidence offered is the opening speech, of

which the versification differs so markedly from what follows. On the strength of that, it is declared that "even THE TEMPEST and KING LEAR are not more unmistakably Shakespearean in character than THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA."

Of late years this fine frenzy of confidence has not been maintained by critical editors, though Hanmer's verdict continues to be ignored. Dyce, indeed, pronounced the play "evidently one of the first of Shakespeare's original productions—that is, of pieces that were not *rifacimenti* of older dramas"; but the obvious fact, recognised by him, that the play is founded, as was observed by Mrs. Charlotte Lennox, on the story of THE SHEPHERDESS FELISMENA in Montemayor's DIANA, coupled with the admitted fact that there was played before Queen Elizabeth in 1584 a HISTORY OF FELIX AND PHILISMENA,[1] suggests to some of his successors the probability that our play derives from that. "Shakespeare's play may very well have been based on this earlier production," remarks Sir Israel Gollancz in his "Temple" edition; and on the archaic rhyming lines II, i, 171-4, winding up with "All this I speak in print, for in print I found it," he justly suggests that the author is "quoting from some play of the 'Two Italian Gentlemen' type." Still he takes for granted that Shakespeare is the adapter, suggesting no other hand.

Nor does Professor Warwick Bond suggest any non-Shakespearean original in his "Arden" edition of the play, though he notes formal echoes of Lilly in the dialogue, and points to EUPHUES as a probable source of the episode of the treachery of Proteus. With Fleay, he surmises a recasting by Shakespeare, not later than 1595; but is inclined to date "the earliest form" of our comedy "about 1590, *though* later than LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST and THE COMEDY OF ERRORS"—a pleasant handful of chronological puzzles for the canonist.

Fleay, for his part, avowed in his MANUAL (1876) that "Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps and I at one time suspected a

[1] PHILIOMENA, in the record, is evidently a mistranscription. Var. Ed. iii, 408.

second author to have written part of it [THE TWO GENTLEMEN]; we have both withdrawn this opinion, which was founded on the ground of numerous expressions not found elsewhere in Shakespeare. They are, however, Shakespearean in manner." Of the style and the versification in general, nothing is said. In his LIFE AND WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE (1886), Fleay puts the opinion that both the GENTLEMEN and ROMEO were "originally written by Shakespeare and some coadjutor," and that the former was first produced in 1591, "with work by a second hand in it, which was cut out and replaced by Shakespeare's own in 1595."[1] The reasons given for the last pronouncement are, in sum, that the allusions to Hero and Leander (I, i, 21; III, i, 119) and to the pestilence (II, i, 20) "distinctly indicate a date after 1593"; and that the mistakes of Padua for Milan and Verona for Milan indicate that the author had begun working on the MERCHANT and on ROMEO. The latter argument, extremely weak at best, begs the question of authorship; and the others are no stronger. The story of Hero and Leander was surely familiar before Marlowe took it up; and there were many pestilences before 1593. Fleay, in fine, misses the real problem set up by the verse-style and the metrics of the play, and for once yields us no light.

In the new Cambridge University Press edition of the play, Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, after avowing that he and his co-editor are convinced that Shakespeare did not write the passage in which Valentine forgives Proteus and offers to surrender Silvia, gingerly proposes to "admit that, after all, there *is* some plausibility in 'the forlorn suggestion' that he [Shakespeare] was—not 'imitating the faults of the older dramatists' but—working on an old play," and that he contemptuously accepted the old *dénouement*. Like other editors, Sir Arthur ignores Blackstone's sensible suggestion that Valentine's staggering proposal[2] to surrender Silvia is

[1] Work cited, pp. 106, 126, 188.

[2] Prof. Bond cites one interpretation by which the line is explained away, and suggests another, to similar effect. Both seem quite inadmissible.

simply an accidental transference to his speech of two lines which properly belong to Thurio's speech beginning

Sir Valentine, I care not for her, I,

a little further on; which might very well dispose of that crux, seeing that there has either been some accident to the text or some bungling curtailment,[1] which leaves Silvia entirely out of the settlement. But our present concern is not with the text but with the authorship of the play; and on that head Mr. Dover Wilson, the able text-editor of the Cambridge edition, assigns to an adapter alike the confusions set up by curtailment and what he recognises as the non-Shakespearean character of certain passages; accepting the play as a Shakespearean original, and dating it before or in 1591. Now, the grounds for the inference that an incompetent adapter was allowed to mangle an early Shakespeare play will equally support the inference that the poor matter is pre-Shakespearean. On Mr. Dover Wilson's theory, the "poor" matter of Speed's clowning is superimposed (after Shakespeare's death?) upon better fooling supplied by Shakespeare in Launce. It would seem, to say the least, more plausible to infer that Speed, at least, is a pre-Shakespearean construction, especially seeing that matter of exactly this kind is found on the pre-Shakespearean stage, and that Mr. Wilson dates the play about 1590. As to Launce, I will submit hereinafter another solution.[2]

But to recognise the poverty of much of the comic relief is only one step in a critical analysis of this play.

[1] See Mr. Dover Wilson's notes, pp. 79, 80, and 82 of ed. cited. In his discussion of MEASURE FOR MEASURE, Mr. Wilson rightly accepts Warburton's suggestion that the Duke's six lines beginning "O place and greatness" (IV, i, 60) have been removed from the Duke's previous speech (III, ii, 196) beginning "No might nor greatness in mortality," to which they clearly belong. In that case the reason for the removal evidently was the perceived need to supply something on the stage while Mariana and Isabella are consulting in the background. The piece of shifted soliloquy is clearly too short; but it was made to serve. Now, in the GENTLEMEN there appears to have been a "cut" at the point under notice; and a stopgap was needed which might seem to account for Julia's swooning. It appears to have been supplied just as in MEASURE FOR MEASURE, by lifting lines from another speech. This was certainly not of Shakespeare's doing.

[2] See Note at the close of this essay.

An un-Shakespearean quality reveals itself first and foremost in the bulk of the versification, as to which the modern editors say little or nothing, thus leaving us wondering upon what principles any disputed play is critically to be pronounced Shakespearean or spurious. Dr. Johnson, it is warrantable to say, had a merely metronomic notion of blank as of rhymed verse, and could not detect rhythmic as distinguished from arithmetical differences.[1] When, again, he dwells on the *gnomai*, the sententious reflections, in this comedy, he raises the question whether he had ever looked at that element in the pre-Shakespearean drama. As for the stamping affirmation of Grant White, its very extravagance is fitted to arouse distrust in any critical reader. The later editors, alike by their hints and their silences, indicate a perception of the presence of non-Shakespearean matter; yet they hardly at all glance at the strongest reasons for pronouncing the play a pre-Shakespearean work, slightly revised by Shakespeare like many others of contemporary origin. There has been, in fact, no adequate critical examination.

II. A Reasoned Hypothesis

As against, then, positions which (1) offer no explanation of the *un*-Shakespearean character of the bulk of the play, (2) take no account of the high proportion of double-endings as against the much lower percentages in plays that are by implication to be dated years later, and (3) entirely ignore (save by implying imitation, and this without examining the admission of Malone) the obtrusive elements of alien and pre-Shakespearean work and phraseology, I now submit a positive thesis which assigns the work as a whole to a pre-Shakespearean hand, ascribing to Shakespeare only a re-writing of the first scene-section, with some later insertion or re-touching, and thus claims to solve all the anomalies of the traditionary view. One difficulty has long withheld me from accept-

[1] Compare Symonds, Blank Verse, pp. 78-81.

ing the solution, and moved me to grope for another; and it is finally upon the perception that that difficulty—a negative one—is itself soluble by the theory, that it is here set forth. The solution is that THE TWO GENTLEMEN is a comedy by Robert Greene, who, however, may here have recast the old play of FELIX AND PHILISMENA.

At the outset we may note one possible counter-claim. Dr. Johnson pointed out that the lines (I, iii, 84-87):

> O how this spring of love resembleth
> The uncertain glory of an April day,
> Which now shows all the beauty of the sun,
> And by and by a cloud takes all away,

are likely to have run originally: "resembleth *right*" and "beauty of the *light*"; and it is perhaps generally admitted that while "resembelleth" is a quite ordinary Tudor scansion, the lines have really been altered as suggested. What has not been noted is that in JACK STRAW (by general assent now assigned to Peele) there occur the lines:—

> Sith mercy in a prince *resembleth right*
> The gladsome sunshine in a winter's day.

Had Peele, then, a hand in our comedy? Another line near-by in the GENTLEMEN (I, iii, 46):

> Here is her hand, the agent of her heart,

echoes yet another in Peele:—

> Sith that my hand, the organ of my heart.
> ARR. OF PARIS, IV, i.

These seem to be the only direct clues of the kind in the play. While, however, it would not be warrantable to say that no entire scene in it can be from Peele's hand, there is so little in the style throughout to suggest him, while there is so much to suggest Greene, that it is reasonable to set down these two parallels to direct imitation by him of Peele. He seems to have esteemed Peele as much as he did anybody; and, frequently echoing as he did Spenser and Lilly and Marlowe, he may very well at times have echoed his friend and collaborator.[1] The

[1] i.e., in the HENRY VI plays.

rest of our enquiry, accordingly, will proceed on the assumption that Greene is the only author decisively indicated. Seeing, indeed, that there are touches which strongly suggest Greene in THE OLD WIVE'S TALE,[1] it may be surmised that Peele and he may have contributed something to each other's plays; and for all we know, Peele, who had the better gift of humour, may have supplied some of the comic relief in the GENTLEMEN. But no one, probably, would assign the main matter of the play to him. It has in general none of the characteristics of his style or versification; and it has definite characteristics of manner and matter which point in another direction.

The "preceding celebrated dramatist" of whom Malone confessed to seeing imitation in "some of the lower dialogues of this comedy" must be either Lilly or Greene. Professor Bond, saying nothing in this connection of Greene, traces to Lilly, as aforesaid, not only an item of plot, but a number of touches in the comic dialogue. But Greene, who took over the whole repertory of phrase and figure and formal antithesis and pseudo-science in EUPHUES for his prose tales, also imitated Lilly in the "comic relief" of his plays, and manipulated his "clown" or serving-man models. And whereas Lilly never passed, save partly in MOTHER BOMBIE, from the plane of his comedies of talk to the comedy of action, while Greene from the first wrote plays of action, the prose dialogue of the GENTLEMEN is far more justly to be termed an imitation of Greene than a play which merely at points imitates or echoes Lilly. The iterations cited by Professor Bond as aping Lilly[2] are really in the beaten way of Greene, who has them by the dozen; and it is the same with the "clowning." Between the verbal fooling of Lilly's servitors and that of Speed and Launce, there had been a manipulation prior to the latter at the hands of Greene; and it is at his level that the low-comedy of the GENTLEMEN substantially remains. The

[1] e.g., the lines of Eumenides beginning "Thou fairest flower of these western parts," in the last scene.

[2] I, i, 36-37; II, vi, 1-3; IV, iv, 98-101; V, iv, 44, 45.

sole exception is the better element in the part of Launce, which will be discussed later. The "comic relief" in such plays as FRIAR BACON and JAMES IV is in fact indistinguishable in quality and manner from that furnished by Speed and much of that supplied by Launce. This weak imitation of an inferior model—whether he had in view Lilly or Greene—Malone was content to regard as a Shakespearean procedure. But it is, in his own words, "very extraordinary" that, having seen the "imitation" of Greene in the poorer comic matter, he should have seen it nowhere else. If, believing the play to be wholly or mainly of Shakespeare's writing, we are to be honest about the "imitation" revealed in it, we must say that he servilely copied Greene in phrase, in *gnomai*, in machinery, in vocabulary, in ethic, in farce, in style, and above all in versification, from the moment that the first scene-section is passed.

This is, of course, not inconceivable *à priori*. Any given artist may have undergone, so far as we know in the absence of record, any given experience in his æsthetic evolution. He may have passed suddenly, by some cerebral cataclysm, from a stage of merely average to one of supreme poetic competence, alike in technique and in ideation, as Browning thought Christopher Smart did when in a state of something like brain-fever he wrote THE SONG OF DAVID. Or, for that matter, a youth who at first took play-making quite unseriously might one day begin to see new possibilities alike in treatment and diction, and above all in the weaving of blank verse, and so, after imitating his contemporaries without a sign of originality, proceed to transcend all predecessors in all three. But it will perhaps be granted by the scrupulous student that such *à priori* solutions should not in any actual case pass current without close scrutiny of the data. They are, to say the least, unsatisfactory, and partake more of the nature of primitive guess-work on the processes of nature than of the methods of modern science. And the phenomena before us may really be found susceptible of scientific analysis of a kind—the kind applicable to the particular problem. After all,

it means only a careful and consistent application of commonsense to the case.

III. The Verse Phenomena.

Let us then agree, as we reasonably may, that the opening scene-section is written (or re-written) by the young Shakespeare, and proceed to examine tentatively the manner of the rest of the piece. The first phenomenon to be noted is the multiplication of double-endings in the blank verse. In the opening section they amount to 7 per cent., the average rate found in the Dream; in the second scene they mount to 16 per cent.; and in Act II, scene iv, they rise to 25, whereafter they vary between 16 and 20.[1] Now, among the "early" plays these rates are reached only in portions of the disputed ones—in the Henry VI trilogy, in Titus, in the Errors, and in Richard II and Richard III. In the undisputed John and 1 Henry IV (it cannot be too often insisted upon) the total rates are only 6·3 and 5·1; and many of the best speeches in those plays are below that percentage. Yet with all its abundance of double-endings the Gentlemen is as markedly primitive in respect of the "end-stopped" character of nearly all its verse as it is inferior to the Dream, the Labour, John and 1 Henry IV in every quality that we regard as going to constitute poetic style. Diction, rhythm, pausation, fluence, are alike flagrantly inferior; that is to say, they visibly become so as soon as we have passed the first scene-section. From such versification as this:—

> Cease to persuade, my loving Proteus:
> Home-keeping youths have ever homely wits.
> Were't not, affection claims thy tender days
> To the sweet glances of thy honour'd love,
> I rather would entreat thy company
> To see the wonders of the world abroad
> Than, living dully sluggardiz'd at home,
> Wear out thy youth in shapeless idleness,

[1] König's count for the play is 18·4. Fleay's first count was 13·4: his second, 18. Prof. Bond gets only 13·25 per cent.; Hertzberg 15. My count bears out König; and Prof. Bond's own figure of 273 double-endings actually yields the 18 percentage, seeing that the blank-verse lines number only some 1,510. He seems to have reckoned his percentage on the total verse lines, rhymed and blank.

—which after all is but average "early Shakespeare"—we pass (by way of some poor prose fooling), to this :—

Julia. But say, Lucetta, now we are alone,
Would'st thou, then, counsel me to fall in love?
Lucetta. Ay, madam, so you stumble not unheedfully.
Julia. Of all the fair resort of gentlemen,
That every day with parle encounter me,
In thy opinion, which is worthiest love?

And this :—

Julia. And yet I would I had o'erlooked the letter.
It were a shame to call her back again,
And pray her to a fault for which I chid her.
What fool is she, that knows I am a maid,
And would not force the letter to my view. . . . .
How churlishly I chid Lucetta hence,
When willingly I would have had her here!
How angerly I taught my brow to frown,
When inward joy enforc'd my heart to smile!
My penance is to call Lucetta back,
And ask remission for my folly past.

We may, if we will, say with Pope that this is notably "simple" and "natural" writing as compared with that of Shakespeare in most of the other plays, early or late. We may even say that it is not ill adapted to the stage. But that is not the issue. Our problem is : Does Shakespeare ever write such woodenly uniform iambic verse —verse in which the *sole* relief to a machine-like monotony is the double-ending? And does he ever reduce serious verse to such strictly prosaic diction? Taking the blank-verse of either the DREAM or the LABOUR as certainly in the main his and also "early," and passing over the more poetically motived speeches, where poetry is for the poet a matter of course, let us note how the verse *moves*, where the pulse of feeling is about or even below the level of Julia's in the speech just cited. We get verse such as this :—

Titania. These are the forgeries of jealousy :
And never, since the middle Summer's spring,
Met we on hill, in dale, forest or mead,
By pavèd fountain or by rushy brook,
Or on the beachèd margent of the sea,
To dance our ringlets to the whistling wind,
But with thy brawls thou hast disturb'd our sport . . . .

Or this :—

Dem. You do impeach your modesty too much,
To leave the City, and commit yourself
Into the hands of one that loves you not;
To trust the opportunity of night
And the ill counsel of a desert place
With the rich worth of your virginity.

Or this :—

Princess. Good Lord Boyet, my beauty, though but mean,
Needs not the painted flourish of your praise :
Beauty is bought by judgment of the eye,
Not utter'd by base sale of chapmen's tongues.
I am less proud to hear you tell my worth
Than you much willing to be counted wise
By spending *your* wit in the praise of mine.

Need we detail the large, organic rhythmical differences, the trochaic openings and alternations, the varying pausation, the interfluence of lines, the inweaving of spondee and anapæst and dactyl, the frequent elusion of cæsura, the easy lifting of the iambic movement to a new fluidity, in which we do not note the "feet" at all? So utterly different is the æsthetic effect, in matter of similar degree of emotional tension, that to ascribe the two styles to one hand about the same period is to ask credence for something unintelligible.

The versification of the DREAM, indeed, is at the very outset so far above the pre-Shakespearean end-stopped norm that it might be doubted whether *as it stands* it can be even so early as 1594. Such lines as these :

Now, fair Hippolyta, our nuptial hour
Draws on apace : four happy days bring in
Another moon; but, O, methinks how slow
This old moon wanes ! she lingers my desires,
Like to a step-dame or a dowager
Long withering out a young man's revenue,

invite the application of Fleay's verdict that in every play which can plausibly be dated before 1594 there are plain marks of later recasting. This verse is rather more *savant* than that of JOHN. But nowhere, in either play, do we get the thin iambic monotony of the bulk of the TWO GENTLEMEN; and if we could agree to see in the opening scene of the ERRORS some of the really earliest

work of Shakespeare, not even there do we have the mechanical beat in question.

It will doubtless be replied that in the ERRORS (after scene i) and RICHARD II, both admittedly "early," we do find monotonous iambic verse, markedly end-stopped. And these plays also the traditionist critics are latterly endeavouring to huddle, with TITUS and the HENRY VI trilogy, into the years before or immediately after 1593, and yet to retain as Shakespearean originals. Let us then examine the phenomena all round. In RICHARD II, which like the GENTLEMEN came early under suspicion of being but a recast, we have such verse as this :—

> O, who can hold a fire [fi-er] in his hand
> By thinking on the frosty Caucasus?
> Or cloy the hungry edge of appetite
> By bare imagination of a feast?
> Or wallow naked in December snow
> By thinking on fantastic summer's heat?
> O no! the apprehension of the good
> Gives but the greater feeling to the worse . . .

And this :—

> I'll give my jewels for a set of beads,
> My gorgeous palace for a hermitage,
> My gay apparel for an almsman's gown,
> My figured goblets for a dish of wood,
> My sceptre for a palmer's walking staff,
> My subjects for a pair of carvèd saints.

Here undoubtedly, we have a strong *initial* iambic movement; and those who are not disturbed by any sense of the presence of Marlowe may without misgiving pronounce it Shakespearean. But even this assumption, which is part of the uncritical traditionist case, would not save the iambics in the GENTLEMEN from special challenge. In the first place this is a *poetic* diction, of much greater pregnancy and energy, many-coloured and imaginative; in the second place, its manner, albeit strongly marked, is not at all that of the verse sampled from the GENTLEMEN. That goes like this, to put the point roughly :—

> Alas, alas, and yet again alas :
> I can't, I can't, I can't, indeed I cannot :
> Away, begone, away, begone, away.

In the samples from RICHARD II, the stresses vary from the norm in nearly every line : in the second sample in every line, by reason of the unstressed " for's," though all remain end-stopped. The line throughout is one of four beats. In the ERRORS, however, along with much that is less monotonous, we have some iambic verse approximating to the commonplace and mechanical character of that in the GENTLEMEN, as here :—

> Ay, ay, Antipholus, look strange and frown :
> Some other mistress hath thy sweet aspècts ;
> I am not Adriana nor thy wife.
> The time was once when thou unurged wouldst vow
> That never words were music to thine ear,
> That never object pleasing in thine eye,
> That never touch well [was ?] welcome to thy hand,
> That never meat sweet-savour'd in thy taste,
> Unless I spake, or look'd, or touch'd, or carv'd to thee

—verse not quite so mechanically uniform as that cited from the GENTLEMEN, and much more vigorous in phrase, but certainly of that order. And it will doubtless be argued that if Shakespeare before or about 1593 wrote tragic verse like the iambics in RICHARD, and comedy verse like this in the ERRORS, he may have written quite tuneless, toneless, songless iambic matter in other comedy verse about the same time.

That position must at once be faced. The answer is threefold. Firstly, if any plays be dated before 1593 they cannot be of Shakespeare's origination, he having declared the VENUS to be the first heir of his invention; and if these be so dated they are but partial recasts. If, on the other hand, they are dated after 1593, their mechanical and end-stopped verse is inexplicable as neighboured with the already vitally different versification of the DREAM and the LABOUR, which last can hardly be put later than 1595, and is probably earlier, though the once-accepted date of 1588 is an absurdity. Thirdly, there is involved for the traditionist in each case the same insoluble anomaly—that while in each play, on the traditionist view, the poet is as it were hypnotically " imitating " in two-thirds of the piece the verse manner of a contemporary (Marlowe in RICHARD and the ERRORS,

Greene in the GENTLEMEN), he yet inserts in all three plays certain passages wholly in his own early manner as exhibited in the DREAM and the LABOUR on the one hand, and in JOHN and 1 HENRY IV on the other. For the opening scene of the ERRORS is in the main as obviously in that manner and versification as the second scene is not; and in Act III, scene ii, of RICHARD, in the King's speech beginning :—

> No matter where; of comfort no man speak,

a speech probably drafted by another hand, we have at least a dozen lines that are wholly out of the Marlowe-Peele-Greene manners and rhythms, and wholly in that of the genuine (that is, in the mass) Shakespearean plays of the early years. The same may be said of much of the gardener scene in RICHARD II (III, iv), where, as in that of the previous scene cited, we have a minimum of double-endings and a marked departure from the iambic and end-stopped norm. This can conceivably be Shakespeare's work : the bulk of the play, with percentages of double-endings far in excess of the much-better written JOHN and 1 HENRY IV, yet in an end-stopped verse of the earliest kind, cannot be his, early or late. But that thesis, of course, must be separately argued; here it can only be indicated.

IV. THE PROBLEM DEVELOPED

Our present thesis, then, involves a systematic challenge to all so-called early work which is at once (*a*) grossly imitative of contemporaries, (*b*) monotonously end-stopped in its blank-verse, (*c*) mechanically iambic for long stretches of that, and (*d*) marked by percentages of double-endings far in excess of those of the DREAM, the LABOUR, JOHN, and 1 HENRY IV, four plays now reckoned by all schools as no less clearly early than wholly or substantially genuine in their blank-verse portions. Further, it specially challenges the Shake-

spearean origin of utterly prosaic diction in blank-verse, such as Proteus' lines (III, ii, 31-33):—

> The best way is to slander Valentine
> With falsehood, cowardice, and poor descent:
> Three things that women highly hold in hate—

matter of the kind that constitutes the bulk of the verse in this comedy. Above all, the thesis takes its stand definitely on the dedication of the VENUS, and denies that we have any critical right to ascribe to Shakespeare the *origination* of plays before 1593. And that position, if accepted, is in itself an estoppel to conceptions of Shakespeare's early manner that have proceeded upon ascriptions to him of original work before 1593.

On the other hand, there is nothing arbitrary in taking as typical of Shakespeare's original dramatic manner the DREAM and the LABOUR. For the latter work, as sampled in our extracts, is for Shakespeare obviously "early"—so early as to leave many good critics satisfied to call the LABOUR the earliest play of all,[1] on the score of its abundance of rhyme and stanza, or the DREAM the earliest in respect of its alleged lesser virtuosity. But if Shakespeare wrote blank-verse like this about 1594 or 1595, when did he pen the breathless tic-tac above sampled from the GENTLEMEN? Inevitably, most of those who assign to him the origination of the play date it *circa* 1590.[2] But to do this is, first, to commit the customary but lawless violence upon Shakespeare's own declaration that the VENUS is the first heir of his *invention*, and, secondly, to become hopelessly entangled in the problem of the double-endings. For how are we to understand Shakespeare's writing about 1590 a play with an 18 percentage of such endings, rising in some scenes to 20 and 25, then suddenly reverting about 1595 or later to the low percentages of JOHN and 1 HENRY IV, and then again recurring to the double-ending in the "later" plays

[1] Thus Mr. Mackail, quoting the first three lines of the LABOUR, pronounces them "the earliest extant piece of Shakespeare's writing." (Brit. Acad. Lect. on Shakespeare, 1916, p. 11.) I should put the opening scene of the ERRORS earlier.

[2] Prof. Bond leaves the date open, but leans to Fleay's view of a revision.

commonly so-called? It is useless to fall back on the ERRORS, for that is equally suspect. The low percentages of JOHN and 1 HENRY IV form an irreducible anomaly.

We may say *à priori* that the anomalous progression *may* have happened; but those who see in artistic growth as in other organic phenomena a process of evolution, will seek carefully for a more intelligible inference before they thus fall back on mystery. Above all, they will insist on a reason for rejecting the capital testimony of Shakespeare himself, given in the dedication of the VENUS. And when they find the traditionists unable to explain that away save by the device of suggesting that the impecunious poet had kept a finished and highly saleable poem unpublished for a number of years, they will the more firmly insist on a search for a more plausible solution. To suppose that the young actor-poet, bent on making his way, had written the VENUS about or before 1590, and yet had withheld it from the press till 1593, missing for years his first great chance of winning reputation, is to stake a thesis on a dogma.

The VENUS is, in point of fact, admittedly modelled as regards form upon Lodge's GLAUCUS AND SCILLA, published in 1589, which fact bars any earlier date;[1] and *could* have been produced by Shakespeare in that or any subsequent year had he been so minded. It might, however, be argued in this connection that this instance of "imitation" tells in favour of the view that in his early dramatic work he is also an imitator. So highly perceptive a critic as Mr. Mackail remarks that "VENUS AND ADONIS is modelled on Lodge; LUCRECE, even more closely, on Daniel."[2] But it would be an æsthetic fallacy to reason from this that the young poet would be an imitator of other men's versification in drama. The VENUS and the LUCRECE were simply poems written for the market in the reigning taste, probably under pressure

[1] The late Professor Churton Collins obliviously dated the VENUS before Shakespeare left home, after admitting that it was modelled on the GLAUCUS AND SCILLA.

[2] Lecture cited, p. 16.

of pecuniary need while the theatres were closed; and, the need past, Shakespeare never published another poem. They were for him simply exercises in accepted rhyme-forms. They are indeed not imitations of the special styles of Lodge and Daniel : they are exercises in their stanza-forms in the prevalent Elizabethan manner of the moment, a manner of concetti and didacticism and sententious reflection, which Lodge and Daniel alike followed, neither having any marked originality of style. Thus the special resemblance of the LUCRECE to the COMPLAINT OF ROSAMOND, as of the VENUS to GLAUCUS AND SCILLA, is chiefly one of stanza form and theme, which goes far to set up an air of imitation all round. If that factor be eliminated, it will be found that Shakespeare's verse is much *more* fluently framed than that of the others, their facility being easily excelled by his. His heart was plainly never in the matter at all : he was doing, for sale and fame, conventional work of a kind that was popular, but could not take hold of him. Yet even in that he did not ape the tics of style or method of his models : LUCRECE remains a narrative poem pure and simple, where Daniel brings his Delia thrice into Rosamond's lament, in the fashionable manner.

But in drama the case was utterly different. There, wherever we can be sure of him in the early plays, he is writing in *his own* early way, with a gift for blank verse exhibited by no rival. That that way was in *some* degree affected by the *better* models before him may readily be granted; but such betrayal of an influence is a profoundly different thing from conscious imitation of styles. Quoting the three opening lines of LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST :

> Let fame, that all hunt after in their lives,
> Live registered upon our brazen tombs,
> And then grace us in the disgrace of death,

Mr. Mackail justly observes that " they are Shakespeare catching and repeating (*yet repeating, as always, with a difference*) the accent of Marlowe." And the difference is fundamental even here, since the verse is already shaking off Marlowe's end-stopped norm, and is *not*

marked by the abundance of double-endings to which Marlowe had attained in 1592. If this be really Shakespeare's first writing that is left us, we have simple influence without imitation; whereas, if we are to stand with the traditionists, we must regard him as relapsing later into the most slavish imitation ever exhibited in literature, copying Marlowe in RICHARD III like one possessed with a devil of apery, attaining in many whole speeches *no* difference, and working up at times a mosaic of "lifted" phrases, as if incapable of writing with his own faculty. To that, the poems offer no parallel.

In truth, the Imitation Theory to which traditionism is latterly being driven will be found on study to be the strangest flout to common-sense ever delivered outside of the Baconian school and its successors. The effort to "keep for Shakespeare" everything assigned to him in the Folio, simply because it *is* in the Folio, leads one critic to insist that in TITUS he cheerfully copied everybody in sight, alike in verse, style, diction, taste, tropes and tags; while another, recognising in the HENRY VI plays a whole series of tags of Marlowe, confidently affirms that Shakespeare deliberately copied those tags as he did the style. Such critics, naturally and necessarily, have no clear perception of verse-manner; but their theory commits them to the belief that he copied verse-manners exactly as he did tags and phrases and diction in general, exploiting in half-a-dozen plays all the verse-styles which he was already able to surpass, and of which he of all men must best have known the inferiority.

The argument, then, must run thus :—As Shakespeare in the rhymed poems copied fashionable models in order to win the public, so in his plays he copied all models to the same end. Capable from the first of a finer verse, a greater style, a subtler diction, he had so little faith in their attractive power that for whole years he tried everybody else's, down to the most abject iteration of their *clichés*, outsinking the most imitative in his imitation of them.

To this one returns the question : How came he, then,

ever to rely on his own manner at all? How dared he venture on the versification of the DREAM and the LABOUR either before or after that unparalleled surrender to the spell of mimicry?

Again the traditionist must posit a cataclysm—a literary miracle of genius elicited by some sudden supernatural troubling of the waters. And all this because traditionism will not face the rational theorem that the plays in the Folio (several of them, as JOHN, HAMLET, LEAR, undeniably *re-writings* of older plays) are in a number of cases but partial *adaptations* of older plays, in which the original authors' work is substantially preserved. To maintain the credit of the Folio and of Meres (who simply stated the claim of the theatre company, which the Folio enforces) Shakespeare must be held to have penned all the horrors of TITUS in all the styles of the period; and this in face of the indisputable fact that many of the plays of the period were at the very outset of composite authorship. And to back up the theatre's claim to his authorship of the HENRY VI trilogy, traditionism actually reverts in recent years to the neck-or-nothing claim that Shakespeare *shared* in the authorship of the two obvious foundation plays, which had been the possession of another company than his.[*] *These* are to be reckoned composite, while none in the Folio is—save where a helpless inconsistency admits perforce that Fletcher had a large share in HENRY VIII. It is in the nature of fallacy to pass from error to worse error, even as Baconics proceeds to assign to Bacon not only the Shakespeare plays but Marlowe's, and Spenser's poetry, and Montaigne's essays, and Burton's ANATOMY OF MELANCHOLY, and the Authorised Version of the Bible. Refusing to follow such a progression, we invoke common-sense to guide us to a tenable conclusion.

[*] The theory that he belonged to the Pembroke company will be found to rest solely on the assumption that he collaborated on their plays—an argument in a circle.

V. Greene's Versification

When we turn to the Two Gentlemen, the hypothesis of imitation is no less unworkable than in any other, from Titus to Richard III. Even in the poems, Shakespeare writes with his own unmatched fluency, with his own diction and phrase. Is it then decently plausible to suppose that in his earliest attempts at independent play construction, after setting out with a versification that is quite above that of his rivals, he would be slavishly imitative not only of the manner of Marlowe in a history play, but also of a technically poorer model in comedy verse, copying the most mechanical iambic work of Greene when he had before him the far more sinewy and powerful, albeit also end-stopped, versification of Marlowe? Did the greatest of the three in the art of blank verse go on for some years as it were maniacally playing the parrot? How came he, after writing in his own early manner in the first scene-section of the Gentlemen, to relapse at once into that other? This alone is so crassly improbable that those who wish to preserve a semblance of fitness for the theory of his primary authorship—framed to start with in obstinate disregard of the dedication of the Venus—must make shift to explain the opening scene-section as a later recast by the poet of his own work.

And there remains yet another obstacle which can be evaded only by dating the play, as Shakespeare's, before the middle of 1592, and thus again defying his own testimony. If it be an imitative exercise of his nonage, it must surely have been penned before Greene, in his Groatsworth of Wit, derided Shakespeare as the Shake-scene or Johannes Factotum who sought to thrust himself in the place of the accredited masters of play-making. To echo a phrase or two of Greene in the Sonnets[1] after 1592 was one thing: to copy him through a whole play was another. For it is Greene that is here imitated throughout, if imitation there be. The mechani-

[1] Assuming that Greene wrote the lines in Edward III about "scarlet ornaments" and "lilies that fester."

cal iambics are his, to the last tick. Thus does he write them in JAMES IV, the strongest of the plays published with his name in that age :—

> Good merchant, lay your fingers on your mouth;
> Be not a blab, for fear you bite yourself.
> What should I term your state, but even the way
> To every ruin in this commonweal!
> You bring in all the means of all excess;
> You rate it and retail it as you please;
> You swear, forswear, and all to compass wealth;
> Your money is your God, your hoard your heaven.

And thus :—

> 'Twixt love and fear continual are the wars;
> The one assures me of my Ida's love,
> The other moves me for my murder'd queen:
> Thus find I grief of that wherein I joy,
> And doubt in greatest hope, and death in weal.
> Alas, what hell may be compar'd with mine,
> Since in extremes my comforts do consist.

It is not *quite* so mortally regular as the speech of Julia before cited; but it is of that brand; and it is further, in manner and substance, so close a parallel to the soliloquy of Proteus over his divided passions as to be in itself a strong clue to the authorship of the latter. It is really not possible to argue that the infant Hercules, Shakespeare, echoing a soliloquy wholly in Greene's manner, could outgo Greene in rigour of iambic monotony. For here is a fairly perfect specimen of that, again from JAMES IV :—

> For what offence, for what default of ours,
> Art thou incens'd so sore against our state?
> Can generous hearts in nature be so stern,
> To prey on those that never did offend?
> What though the lion, king of brutish race,
> Through outrage sin, shall lambs be therefore slain?
> Or is it lawful that the humble die
> Because the mighty do gainsay the right?

And there are scores of such lines in this, clearly one of Greene's later plays, in which the result of his special reversion to rhyme in drama as against the rest of the Marlowe school is seen in a more muscle-bound blank-verse than that of any of the others, even though his drama has become more intellectual. This fact will, I

think, be found to solve the one difficulty presented by the TWO GENTLEMEN, considered as a work of Greene, slightly adapted by Shakespeare.

That difficulty is the percentage of double-endings. In the plays published over his name Greene has attained no such percentage; and the natural first assumption is that he did not lend himself to the mode in question. But there are sufficient grounds for thinking that he would and did. Though only seven plays have been collected and published as of Greene's writing, of which three are still under challenge,[1] there is no doubt that he did write a great many plays in his short literary life. Nashe's phrase, "writ more than four other,"[2] would be fairly decisive even without Greene's own posthumous claim and other testimony. Even, then, if (1) GEORGE-A-GREENE, with its marked increase in double-endings over JAMES IV, be put aside as doubtful, and (2) Act II of EDWARD III be denied to be a re-writing by Greene of a Marlowe draft, there is still no good reason for doubting that Greene followed the movement towards double-endings as did Kyd. In FRIAR BACON AND FRIAR BUNGAY, which is to be dated after FAUSTUS, being visibly an attempt to compete with that play in the exploitation of the "magic" interest, we find already a considerable resort to the double-ending as compared with ORLANDO FURIOSO. The play has over 30 in all; and in the debate between Vandermast and Bungay in scene ix there are six to 47 lines—over 12 per cent. In JAMES IV, where there is a reversion to rhyme, there are only some 23 double-endings, which would be a natural result. But whether or not Greene be the author of GEORGE-A-GREENE, any return on his part to a free use of blank-verse would quite inevitably involve his acceptance of the movement, led by Marlowe, to the partial liberation of the verse-norm in the matter of double-endings.

That movement was, in fact, the natural device of men

[1] SELIMUS, rightly (in my opinion) assigned to Greene by Grosart, is claimed by Mr. Crawford as Marlowe's; ALPHONSUS OF ARRAGON is challenged by Mr. E. H. C. Oliphant; and GEORGE-A-GREENE by Dr. Greg.

[2] Sc. playwrights for the particular company.

who needed to relieve a monotonous verse-form, and who had not the gift of doing so by way of spontaneously varying rhythm. Marlowe, the strongest of the school, is visibly the leading innovator. Even in TAMBURLAINE, albeit with a low percentage, there are many more double-endings than in the SPANISH TRAGEDY, which has barely a dozen; and though Marlowe does not greatly increase his total percentages in the later plays published as his, his progression is made certain by the translation of Lucan. That, with the clusters found in scenes of EDWARD II and RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, entitles us *quoad hoc* not only to credit him with setting the pace, but to look to him for the percentages in the Roses scene of 1 HENRY VI and in RICHARD III. The double-ending was, in fact, the one mode of metrical variation readily open to Marlowe, in view of his fixed addiction to the end-stopped line-rhythm, and his sheer energy would impel him to develop it. For the same reason, Kyd, who had much less of either flexibility or energy of line than Marlowe, would welcome the relief, to which he has freely resorted in SOLIMAN and in ARDEN as well as in the latter portion of CORNELIA. The adjustment can be seen, alike among the predecessors and among the successors of Shakespeare, to have been a matter of course. The Master was precisely the one who least needed it, he having of all the performers the greatest faculty of spontaneous variation of blank-verse rhythm. In 1 HENRY IV he is still at his play-minimum while writing incomparably the most flexible verse hitherto produced. His later full acceptance of the additional resource of the double-ending was for him but an item in the progressive liberation of his style. For all the others, the acceptance was an obvious need.

And for none was the need more urgent, the mechanical gain more obvious, than for Greene, in whom the preference for rhyme had operated as a restriction on the possible freedom of blank verse, by stressing the habit of metric accent. Shakespeare's very gift for blank-verse might be held to dictate his abandonment (save in the Sonnets) of rhyme after he had fully found his supreme

instrument. But for Greene, so long held by the prestige of rhyme, the example of Marlowe's multiplication of the double-ending was bound to be finally as persuasive as it obviously was for Kyd, and doubtless was even for Peele. When, then, we find in the Two Gentlemen, with a multitude of traces of his manner, his diction, his sententiousness, his ethic, and his dramatic method, the phenomenon of a proportion of double-endings not reached in his otherwise known work, we are critically entitled to decide that he had finally made the progression as completely as did Kyd, on Marlowe's lead. That he should carry the device to the extent of a run of nine double-endings in Act II, scene iv, is quite in keeping with his general exuberance. The naturalness of that progression being recognised, it remains only to set forth the decisive evidence of his handiwork.

VI. Specific Clues to Greene

That the comic relief is in the manner of Greene will be denied by no one who has read his clown-sections. The servant-and-master scenes in the Gentlemen and James IV are from one indigent mint, with the sole difference that in the latter piece, which is melodrama, two play the knave as well as the clown. Slipper's discourse (I, ii) on the points of a horse and a woman is the pattern of Launce's prattle (III, i) on the points of a woman and a horse—which is, however, rather duller and more tedious. Speed's prattle to Valentine in II, i, is Greenean in every clause, with four of his tics—"to wreathe your arms like a malcontent," "ABC," "presently," and "metamorphosed." Nano's indecencies in James are on a par with Lucetta's, which again are the more laboured. In both, the theme of a woman disguised as a youth is jested on. In their fundamental moral perversity the pieces are closely akin, in that in each case we are called upon to forgive the unforgivable—James for planning to betray his wife on his wedding-day, and to murder her soon afterwards; Proteus for his treachery and villainy.

"Forgive mine *errors* past" is the form of one of James's appeals at the close, after failing to have his queen assassinated. Exactly so does Proteus rank as "error" (v, iv, 111) the fickleness which had sunk in his case to foul ruffianism. The soliloquies of James and Proteus on their changes of choice are as exactly akin as the prattle of the serving-men in the two plays. And we are invited by the tradition to suppose that Shakespeare, the poet born, learned his business by such abject mimicry.

It has been argued, indeed, by Sir Israel Gollancz and others, that free pardon for foul treachery is in Shakespeare's own way, as exhibited in the Sonnets and in the TEMPEST. But it is in this connection to be observed that the situation in the Sonnets is profoundly different from that in the comedy; and further it is to be particularly remembered that in A WINTER'S TALE Shakespeare proceeds upon Greene's prose tale PANDOSTO (perhaps previously dramatised by its author?), and that there we find Greene making the jealous King as odious at the end as at the beginning, where Shakespeare contrives to make him at length fit for forgiveness. In the GENTLEMEN, Proteus passes in two minutes from the grossest blackguardism to accepted repentance. This is a feature running all through Greene's prose fiction, and evidently deriving from his sinister character. And if we were to look anywhere for the pre-Shakespearean play underlying MUCH ADO, where Shakespeare has certainly rewritten the bulk, and where we are yet called upon to forgive as does Hero the offensive Claudio, it would be to Greene that we should most fitly turn.

But it lay in Greene, nevertheless, to produce the better features of our play as well as the worse. As against his blemishes there stands out the singular fact that he is the first of the pre-Shakespeareans to create in his plays women who are at once lovable and life-like; so that the limner of Margaret in FRIAR BACON and of Dorothea in JAMES IV was equal to the drawing of both Silvia and Julia. And when we turn from matter to manner we find not only that identity of iambic move-

ment in nine-tenths of the blank verse—the chief exception being Valentine's speech (v, iv):—

> How use doth breed a habit in a man,

where we may detect the higher rhythm of Shakespeare—but a pervading reminiscence of Greenean phrase and vocabulary. What Pope called the simple and natural cast of the diction is found throughout Greene's work. Apart from the intolerable euphuism of phrase and trope in his prose stories, a manner copied wholesale from Lilly, his vocabulary is habitually simple, being that of a man always writing rapidly, without concern for either variety of cadence or subtlety of expression. Euphuism was his sole equivalent for subtlety in his diction. As a poet he is often charming, never pregnant or greatly memorable. But the *gnomai*, the sententious observations, which appealed to Dr. Johnson in the TWO GENTLEMEN, are part of Greene's regular stock-in-trade. His stories pullulate with saws and proverbs and moral reflections after the manner of Lilly; the *sententiae, similitudines et dicendi flores* of Renaissance classicism; and in his plays we have an abundance of both. For instances:—

> The body's wounds by medicines may be eas'd,
> But griefs of mind by salves are not appeas'd.
>
> JAMES IV, IV, iv.

> Make choice of friends, as eagles of their young,
> Who soothe no vice, who flatter not for gain.
>
> *Id.* I, i.

> Like a bee, Love hath a little sting.
>
> *Id. ib.*

> She that sits at Fortune's feet a-low,
> Is sure she shall not taste a further woe.
>
> *Id.* II, i.

> The pilot in the dangerous seas is known.
>
> *Id.* II, ii.

> Men seek not moss upon a rolling stone.
>
> *Id. ib.*

> Seeds must have time to sprout before they spring.
>
> FRIAR BACON (Dyce, 161*b*).

The higher tree, the sooner is his fall.
ALPHONSUS OF ARRAGON, I, i.

In vain it is to strive against the stream.
Id. ib.

Hasty purposes have hated ends.
SELIMUS, l. 1372.

Hate is peculiar to a prince's state.
Id. l. 1396.

To be great and happy, these are twain.
JAMES IV, III, iii.

A quiet life doth pass an empery.
ALPHONSUS, I, i.

Delay is dangerous, and procureth harm.
The wanton colt is tamed in his youth;
Wounds must be cured when they be fresh and green;
And pleurisies, when they begin to breed,
With little ease [care?] are driven away with speed.
Id. III (Dyce, p. 236*b*).

What is more, the sententious sayings in the TWO GENTLEMEN are in almost every case distinctly traceable to Greene. As thus:

(1) The tag, "to make a virtue of necessity" (IV, i, 62), which recurs with a difference in RICHARD II (I, iii, 278), occurs at least thrice in Greene's prose—in his MENAPHON (Arber's rep. p. 71); in his CARDE OF FANCIE (Works, iv, 60); and in his FAREWELL TO FOLLY (Works, ix, 262). He has also "Make a virtue of her need" in PANDOSTO (Hazlitt's Sh. Lib. rep. p. 33) and "Making necessity the present time's best policy" (MENAPHON, p. 69).

(2) "Wilt thou reach stars because they shine on thee?" (III, i, 156) is a variant of: "Stars are to be looked at with the eye, not *reached at* with the hand," in PANDOSTO[1] (Hazlitt's Shak. Lib., iv, 60).

(3) Julia's lines (II, vii, 24):—

The more thou *damm'st it up*, the more it burns:
The current that with gentle murmur glides,
Thou knowst, being stopped, impatiently doth rage,

[1] Copied from Lilly: "Stars are to be look'd at, not reached at." (CUPID AND CAMPASPE, III, v.)

reproduce one of Greene's favourite sets of commonplaces:—

> The oven *dampt up*[1] hath the greatest heat; fire suppressed is most forcible; the streams *stopped* either break through or overflow; and sorrows concealed, etc.
> NEVER TOO LATE (Works, viii, 84).

> Heat suppressed is the more violent; the stream *stopped* makes the greater deluge; and passions concealed, etc.
> *Id. ib.* p. 103.

> The oven the closer it is *dammed up*, the greater is the heat. TULLY'S LOVE (vii, 144).

> To repress the fire is to increase the flame.
> ORPHARION (xii, 34).

Of saws of this kind, frequently coupled with a formula about "sorrows concealed," as in TITUS ANDRONICUS (II, iv, 36), there are at least eight repetitions in Greene's prose tales; and the manner in the passage in the GENTLEMEN is as absolutely his as the matter.

It is true that this triple figure of oven and stream and sorrow concealed is reproduced in the VENUS AND ADONIS (331-4):—

> An oven that is *stopp'd*, or river stay'd,
> Burneth more hotly, swelleth with more *rage*:
> So of *concealed sorrow* may be said,
> Free vent of words love's fire doth assuage.

But it is this very multiplicity of uses of the tag that vetoes the ascription of it to Shakespeare in the GENTLEMEN as in TITUS. The fire figure had *already* been used in the GENTLEMEN (I, ii, 30). Greene in this way repeats dozens of tags parrot-wise: Shakespeare, in his certain work, does not; and we may reasonably say of the young Shakespeare that he could not. In the VENUS and LUCRECE, producing verse for the market with his infinite facility, he throws in tags that he had heard in the theatre[2]; and even in the Sonnets he has two lines from EDWARD III, as aforesaid. But even

[1] This also is in Lilly: EUPHUES, Arber's rep., p. 63. And the "fire suppressed" figure occurs in the FAERIE QUEENE, II, i, 44. Greene constantly echoed both Lilly and Spenser.

[2] "Engine of her thoughts" is another echo in the VENUS (367) from TITUS (III, i, 82). This time it is a Peelism.

if the test of verse style did not bar the ascription to him of the lines in the two plays, the *fourfold* use of one hackneyed trope, already run to death by Greene in his prose, must be pronounced a thing impossible for Shakespeare. The greatest of all dramatic poets cannot have been the most servile and unabashed of all copyists in dramatic poetry. Greene had used the figure many times before 1592.

(4) The case is much the same with the lines (II, iv, 189-90):—

> Even as one heat another heat expels,
> Or as one nail by strength drives out another.

Greene has:—

> The last driveth out the first, as one nail forceth out another.
> NEVER TOO LATE (Works, viii, 103).

This was a standing Elizabethan tag; and we have:

> Thus one nail helps to drive the other out,

in what appears to be a Greene scene in ALPHONSUS OF GERMANY (II, ii, near end).

(5) So again with the proverb (IV, iv, 19-20):

> You know that love
> Will creep in service where it cannot go,

which points to Greene's[1]

> Love ought to creep as doth the dial's shade.
> FRIAR BACON (Dyce's Greene and Peele, p. 161*b*).
>
> If love may creep . . . . *Id.*, p. 169*a*.
>
> Love creepeth on by degrees . . . love . . . should enter into the eye, and by long gradations pass into the heart.
> MENAPHON (Arber's rep., p. 39).
>
> Love . . . must easily creep.
> MAMILLIA: Works, ii, 264.

(6) The *idea* of Valentine's speech (III, i, 89):—

> Win her with gifts, if she respect not words.
> Dumb jewels often, in their silent kind,
> More than quick words do move a woman's mind,

[1] Also frequent in Lilly's EUPHUES. Arber's rep., pp. 110, 111, 117.

is put in Greene's GROATSWORTH OF WIT, as in many of his tales; and the commonplace (JAMES, II, ii):—

> Ladies love presents, pomps, and high estate,

recurs as often.

Turning from the *gnomai* so-called (hardly with propriety to be so described) to the vocabulary and phraseology in general, we note a new series of Greenean specialties of phrase. For instances: (1) the line (II, iv, 87):—

> Did hold his eyes *lock'd* in her *crystal looks*

is made up of ever-recurring tics of Greene's:—

> And *lock'd* him in the *brightness* of her *looks*
> FRIAR BACON, II, ii (Dyce's Greene and Peele, p. 161*a*).
>
> And not lie *fetter'd* in fair Helen's *looks*
> *Id.*, IV, iii (p. 179*b*).
>
> *Crystal looks.*
> Verses in MENAPHON (Dyce, p. 287*b*).
>
> Her crystal chin. *Id.*, p. 289*b*.
>
> Her *crystal eyes.*
> Canzone in NEVER TOO LATE (*Id.*, p. 296*a*).
>
> Her eyes like glassy streams.
> Doron's lines in MENAPHON (Arber, p. 41).

(Compare "Grey . . . . were his eyne," p. 294*b*, and "Her eyes are grey as *glass*," TWO GENTLEMEN, IV, iv, 197.)

> Her starry *looks*, her *crystal eyes.*
> Palmer's Ode in NEVER TOO LATE (Dyce, p. 298*b*).
>
> Wrapped their *looks* in the trammels of her *locks.*
> THE MOURNING GARMENT (Works, ix, 133).
>
> *Crystal* brooks, such were her *eyne.*
> Philador's Ode in THE MOURNING GARMENT (Dyce, p. 307).
>
> And *lock'd* men's *looks*[1] within their golden hair.
> Verses in TULLY'S LOVE (Dyce, p. 311).

(2) Of the same order of echo is the line (IV, ii, 100):

> For me, by this pale queen of night I swear.

The "pale queen of night" figures in Greene's part of EDWARD III (II, i, 143).

[1] "Looks" is often used by Marlowe. It is the collocation with "lock'd" that points to Greene.

(3) Another Greeneism (found also in Marlowe) is: "She is my essence" (III, i, 182). The last word recurs only twice in the Folio, and the second use is not in this application. But Greene has:—

> My . . . . prince, the essence of my soul.
> JAMES IV, II, iii (Dyce, p. 201*b*).
>
> We [husband and wife] are one heart . . .
> One soul, one essence, doth our weal contain.
> *Id.*, III, iii (p. 206*a*).
>
> Angelica. . . . life to my life and essence to my joy.
> ORLANDO FURIOSO (p. 96*b*).
>
> He was . . . the divided half of my essence, soul to my joys.
> MENAPHON (Arber's rep., pp. 62-63).
>
> He that hath the feeling taste of love
> Derives his essence from no earthly toy.
> Melicertus' Epilogue in MENAPHON (Dyce, p. 290*a*).
>
> The effectual essence of her loves.
> GREENE'S MOURNING GARMENT (Works, ix, 162).

Editors assume that the speech cited must be Shakespeare's because of the phrases about banishment, recalling ROMEO AND JULIET. The more just reflection would be that the marked repetition is in itself un-Shakespearean, and that at least one of the passages is presumptively not his; though some critics will doubtless adhere to Furnivall's view of the poet as spontaneously repeating himself in that fashion. The Imitation Theory, indeed, inevitably involves the notion of the imitator chronically imitating himself, like the Wordsworthian child:

> As if his whole vocation
> Were endless imitation.

It may be a relief to some to realise that rational criticism delivers us from both forms of theoretic belittlement; though it should be specially satisfactory to know that Shakespeare was not a slavish parodist of Greene.

(4) Proteus soliloquises (IV, ii, 5) that

> Silvia is too fair, too true, too holy
> To be corrupted by my worthless gifts.

In JAMES IV the villain Ateukin says of Ida (II, ii: Dyce, p. 201*b*):—

> She's holy wise and too precise for me.

(5) "Set the world on wheels" (III, i, 317) is the only instance in the Shakespeare plays of that old tag.[1] It occurs repeatedly in Greene, e.g. :—

> The world doth run on wheels.
> JAMES IV, I, ii.

> Goes the world on wheels?
> THIEVES FALLING OUT, rep. in Harleian Miscel., 8vo ed. iv, 240.

(6) In "wailful sonnets," again (III, ii, 69) we have a variant of Greene's "doleful madrigals of sorrow" (MENAPHON, p. 25); and when we note that "wailful" occurs only this once in all the plays, and that Greene runs to such formations as "griefful," "plaintful," "faintful," "yearnful," the inference to him is strong. In NEVER TOO LATE (Works, viii, 35) we have the *idea* of wooing by sonnets, in the phrase "plead with sonnets"; and the entire line :

> By wailful sonnets whose composed rhymes,

is again an obvious variant of

> Framing their ditties in conceited lines.
> ORLANDO FURIOSO, Dyce, p. 97*a*.

(7) "Heart-sore sighs," occurring twice in this play (I, iv, 30; II, i, 132) and never again in the Folio, carries the same inference. Greene constantly works in sighs and moans :—

Heart-breaking sighs and abundance of tears.	PHILOMELA (Works, xi, 163).
Heart-breaking moans.	MAIDEN'S DREAM, st. 3.
Heart-sick pains.	*Id.*, st. 5.
Sighs so *sore*.	*Id.* (repeatedly).
And sighed as if her heart-strings straight should crack.	*Id.*, st. 36.
Gasping sighs.	PANDOSTO, as cited, p. 34.
Heart's sighs.	Theodora's song in GREENE'S VISION (Works, XII, 243).
Deep-drawn sighs.	MENAPHON (Arber, p. 25).
Scalding sighs.	*Id.*, p. 34.

[1] Found twice in THE TWO ITALIAN GENTLEMEN.

His utterance full of broken sighs.
Id., p. 51.

Far-fetched sighs. MAMILLIA: Works, ii, 260.

His heart ready to burst with sighs.
THIEVES FALLING OUT
(Harl. Misc. rep. ed. 1809, iv, 262).

Such sighs that he thought . . . . her heart would have cleaved asunder. *Id.*, p. 263.

Probably no one who is not deeply committed to the Imitation Theory will argue that Shakespeare was likely to write "heart-sore sighs" *twice* in successive acts of one play. Greene was. He repeated tic phrases on the same page, whether purposively or obliviously. In MENAPHON he tries every variety of characterization of the sighs of his various performers; in the last-cited tract we see him carefully manipulating variants of one formula; and in "heart-sore sighs" he seems to have congratulated himself on achieving a novelty which would well bear repetition. It is the same with "doleful madrigals" and "wailful sonnets," "composed rhymes" and "conceited lines." And just such a self-echo is to be traced between the line in our play (I, ii, 65):—

And ask remission for my folly past,

and one in JAMES IV (IV, v):—

Craving remission for her late contempt.

Simple clues of vocabulary repeatedly reinforce the general inference. (1) The use of "include" at the close of the play (V, iv, 161):

Come, let us go. We will include all jars
With triumphs, mirth, and rare solemnity,

is doubtfully explained by some editors as meaning "conclude." Here it really means "bury"; and in JAMES IV (II, iv) we have the clue:—

O that I were included in my grave.[1]

(2) The last word in the line (I, iii, 18),

Whereon this month I have been hammering,

[1] "Include" in the physical sense occurs twice again in Greene's plays.

occurs elsewhere in the plays only in the non-Shakespearean 1 HENRY VI and TITUS.[1] It is a hard-worked expression in Greene.

(3) "Sunbright," in the line (III, i, 88):

> To be regarded in her sunbright eye,

occurs nowhere else in the Concordance. It is a favourite epithet of Greene's,[2] in the same application :—

> Her sun-bright face.
> Radagon's Sonnet in NEVER TOO LATE (Dyce, p. 301*a*).
>
> Sun-bright Venus.
> Melicertus' lines in MENAPHON (Dyce, p. 287*b*).
>
> Their eyes like sun-bright beams.
> MENAPHON (Arber's rep., p. 47).
>
> The sun-bright goddess, smiling with her eye.
> A MAIDEN'S DREAM (Dyce, p. 282*a*).
>
> Sun-bright as is the eye of summer's day.
> LOOKING-GLASS FOR LONDON (Dyce, p. 136*b*).

(4) The word "o'er-slips" occurs only in this play in all "Shakespeare." It is many times used by Greene as a verb.

(5) *Reasonless* occurs only in this play and in the non-Shakespearean 1 HENRY VI. This, too, is a word of Greene's (GROATSWORTH, rep. in *Sh. Allusion Books*, p. 21, l. 34).

(6) *Endamage* (III, ii, 43) occurs only in this play and in the non-Shakespearean 1 HENRY VI. Greene has the word at least twice in his prose.

(7) *Lumpish* (III, ii, 62), occurring only in this play in the entire Folio, is a formation of a kind in which Greene abounds. In seven lines of ALPHONSUS OF ARRAGON (IV, ii : Dyce, p. 240*b*) he has *hardish*, *darkish*, *greenish*. Elsewhere he often has *dumpish*, which might have been the word in the MS. here, though there are instances of *lumpish*.

[1] "Hammer'd," in the same sense, in W. TALE.
[2] Echoed from Marlowe.

(8) *Descant* (I, ii, 94) is another non-Shakespearean word, occurring only here and in RICHARD III; and the line here:

> And mar the concord with too harsh a descant,

is a variant of many such phrases in Greene's prose tales.[1] It is one of his commonest tics.

Yet further, even in one of the passages which Shakespeare has re-written, the opening dialogue, the sentiments (as also in I, iii) are a paraphrase of matter in Greene's MOURNING GARMENT (1590). There we have the same general plea for travel, with the phrases: "Buy that abroad with travel which at home could be purchased with no treasure," "Travel, father, is the mother of experience";[2] "Men are not born to be tied to their cradles; nor ought we with the tortoise to carry our house upon our back"; "if Plato had lived still in Greece . . . .";[3] "Seeing then, sir, I am in the flower of my youth, living at home, only to feed your looks, let me not idly pass over the flower of my age";[4] and so forth. And when we actually find in this short opening scene-section, with its early Shakespearean versification, no fewer than seven words and compounds and phrases which occur only here or only in this play in the whole of "Shakespeare," we are in honesty bound to recognise that he is here but *re-writing* another man's work.

The once-used words in the first 62 lines are these:— *Home-keeping*, *sluggardized*, *noteworthy*, *love-book*, *betideth* (repeated in IV, iii, l. 40) and the once-used phrases "over shoes [also 'over boots'] in love," and the already noted "heart-sore sighs" (repeated in II, iv, l. 132, with the word *penitential*, which also occurs nowhere else in the Folio). Here again we are at once pointed to Greene:—

> Over the shoes in a little love.
>
> MOURNING GARMENT (Works, ix, 176).

[1] I have noted over a dozen instances. E.g.: "Thus those lovers in a humorous descant of their prattle." MENAPHON, p. 55.

[2] Compare, in a later scene (I, iii, 22), Antonio's "Experience is by industry achieved."

[3] Works, ix, 133.

[4] Id., p. 134.

Over her shoes [in love]
GREENE'S METAMORPHOSIS (ix, 91).

Over the shoes [in love]
MENAPHON (Arber's rep., p. 45).

Over her shoes [in love]
PANDOSTO (Works, iv, 276).

Over the shoes in affection.
TULLY'S LOVE (Works, vii, 151).

With such reason for inferring his hand even under Shakespeare's re-writing, it is unnecessary to multiply evidence from vocabulary as to his presence in the bulk of the play, where manner and matter and method and diction alike tell of him. I have therefore not sifted the haystack of Greene's Works for instances of all the words that occur only in this play in the Shakespeare Concordance. They include :—

Contemptuously, disability, gingerly, impose (sb.), inscrutable, lawlessly, movingly, noteworthy, parable, penitential, perversely, publisher, rifle (vb.), swarthy, tarriance, visibly;

but, as it happens, the first four words in the alphabetical list set up Greenean reminiscences :—

A-good (IV, iv, 170). Greene has "a-late" and other such formations. Marlowe has "a-good."

Bottom (vb. : III, ii, 53). Greene has :—
In frigates bottom'd with rich Sethin planks.
FRIAR BACON (Dyce, p. 165*a*).

Braggardism (II, iv, 164). Greene has both "braggardes" and the verb "braggard" in his prose.

Churlishly (I, ii, 60). At least twice in Greene, Works, xi, 218, 264;

as do the following :—

Fodder (I, i, 92). Occurs in Greene, Works, vii, 203.

Metamorphosed (I, i, 66; II, i, 32). Occurs many times in Greene.

Pound (sb. = place of impounding : I, i, 113). In GEORGE-A-GREENE, repeatedly.

Full-fraught (III, ii, 70). Greene has "fraughted so full of fiery passions" (ORLANDO: Dyce, p. 95*b*) and "fraught" and "fraughted" often in metaphor.

Shelving (III, i, 115). "Shelf," with this application, occurs twice in MENAPHON, p. 24; and "shelves" in FRIAR BACON (Dyce, p. 171*b*).

Sun-bright. (Noted above as frequent in Greene).

Turmoil (II, vii, 37). "Turmoils" in MENAPHON, p. 25.

Rifle (IV, i, 4). Greene has "rifler": Works, x, 87, and the verb in the SECOND PART OF CONNY-CATCHING, Bodley Head rep., p. 55.

Noteworthy (I, i, 13). Greene has "view-worthy": vii, 100.

Unprevented (III, i, 21). In Greene: v, 125.

"Sluggardised" occurs only in this play in the entire Folio; and "sluggard" also only once, in RICHARD III. I have not noted "sluggardised" in Greene; but he has "sluggard" frequently—twice in one speech in ORLANDO (Dyce, pp. 93, 94). "Sluggardism" and "braggardism" thus alike suggest themselves as Greenean coinages. They are not in the manner of Shakespeare.[1]

The series of once-used compounds in the play:—

cruel-hearted, direction-giver, dire-lamenting, heaven-bred, home-keeping, lily-tincture, love-affairs, love-book, love-discourse, love-wounded, odd-conceited, silver-shedding, sourest-natured, spaniel-like, summer-swelling, sun-expelling, sweet-complaining, sweet-suggesting, true-confirmed, true-devoted, well-reputed,

are all in Greene's manner, and probably many of them are to be found in his prose. He has:—

love-day, love-lay, love-lock, love-mates, love-nest, love-powders, fond-conceited; strange-conceited;

[1] It may be worth while to note, in this connection, a common misconception in regard to the phrase "Why, boy; why, wag," in the last Act (v, iv, 86). Mr. Dover Wilson notes it as "curious language for Valentine, who has never seen 'Sebastian' before"—apparently regarding "wag" as an incongruous pleasantry. But "wag" in the period properly meant only "boy"—with a tendency to imply "boyish" character. It is so used repeatedly in HENRY IV. And Greene uses it repeatedly in its primary force, as in the phrase: "stood in a maze how so young a wag should be so expert in his weapon" (MENAPHON, p. 84), and in the line: "Love, like a wag, straight div'd into my heart" (FRIAR BACON: Dyce, p. 161*b*)—where the implication seems to be: "the wag, Cupid." Venus calls Cupid "wag" in his TULLY'S LOVE (Works, vii, 108), as does Marlowe in DIDO.

as against "lumpish" he has "dumpish" at least six times; and as against "conceitless" (IV, ii, 96) he has somewhere the phrase "of such poor conceit" used with exactly the same application.

Of words occurring only in this play and in one other, we may note (1) "scandalised" (II, vii, 61, and 1 HENRY IV, I, iii, 154). Greene has the verb "scandalise" in the LOOKING-GLASS (Dyce, p. 132*a*) with the same force. (2) The phrase "the wonders of the world," occurring in the opening speech and in the form "the wonder of the world" in LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST, points also to Greene, who has "the world's wonder" thrice in MENAPHON, and "the earth's wonder" and "the wonder of the earth" in the LOOKING-GLASS (Dyce, p. 122*b*). (3) "Great potentates" (II, iv, 79) is in similar case. That particular phrase occurs only here, and the word "potentates" only in LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST and 1 HENRY VI among the other plays. But Greene has "great potentates, earth's miracles for state," and "potentates of might," in the last scene of FRIAR BACON; also "mighty potentates" twice in the same play.

These numerous verbal and phrasal clues would in themselves, numerous as they are, constitute no decisive proof of Greene's authorship. In the LABOUR, where also there are many such instances of words used only once or seldom which belong to the common vocabulary of Greene and other pre-Shakespeareans, a very careful inquiry would be necessary before we could reasonably decide whether or not they stood for a groundwork in a prior play. Shakespeare, like other men, had to acquire his vocabulary from his predecessors, and alike in the poems and the sonnets we find him reminiscent of the vocabulary and phraseology of the contemporary stage.

But when we find, as here, that manner and matter, versification and diction, theme and method, all alike concur in the most marked degree in pointing to another hand than Shakespeare's, the endless coincidences in phrase and identities of vocabulary have a cumulative force, completing the proof. To have deliberately imitated all—tinkling versification, characterization,

comic relief, plot devices, treachery and the condonement of treachery, indecencies, moralisings, saws, tags, and proverbs, with a special selection of words from the same model which were never to be used again—would have been a kind of literary prostration, the ascription of which to the master dramatist, of all men, is surely a negation of every rule of rational inference. If the Imitation Theory be thus posited in reckless disregard of every consideration to the contrary, its exponents, we may say with some confidence, will have taken more than the amount of rope requisite to hang it.

VII. Conclusion

The ascription to Greene of The Two Gentlemen of Verona, thus borne out by every kind of internal test, will be found to clear up a problem of literary history raised by some of the contemporary comments after Greene's death. Those comments concur in representing him as at once the most fecund and the most successful comedy-writer of his day. Nashe testifies that he wrote for the Queen's Company "more than four other," and Chettle, in Kind-Hart's Dreame, pronounces him "of singular pleasaunce, the very supporter, and, to no man's disgrace be this intended, the only comedian of a vulgar writer in this country." Finally, in the rhymed tract, Greene's Funeralls, by R. B. (1594), among many other encomiums, we have this:—

> Greene gave the ground to all that wrote upon him.
> Nay more, the men that so eclipst his fame
> Purloined his plumes: can they deny the same?

It is needless to discuss the critical value of the friendly estimate of Greene's work, which is that of a man of little literary force. But he is a straightforward witness, and the challenge put by him in the last cited line has never been duly weighed.

At whom does it point? The only men of that day who, so far as we now know, could be said to have

eclipsed Greene's fame, were Marlowe, deceased in 1593, Kyd, and Shakespeare. Of neither Marlowe nor Kyd can the phrase be understood in the context; and unless it applies to Shakespeare it remains an enigma. But if the TWO GENTLEMEN and portions of the HENRY VI plays were of Greene's writing, and were already claimed by the theatre as Shakespeare's in respect of his revision, the charge, though critically unimportant to us to-day, would be intelligible enough. And if already there had been produced an early form of MUCH ADO, and an early form of ALL'S WELL; and if *those* plays also were known to be of Greene's drafting, it would be very completely intelligible.

I have elsewhere given some of the reasons for holding that Greene drafted the play which underlies ALL'S WELL, partly recast by Shakespeare and largely by Chapman; and the latest editors of MUCH ADO recognise that that play as it stands is a recast of an older one, which, however, Mr. Dover Wilson thinks, may, so far as the internal evidence takes us, have been drafted by Shakespeare himself. That is to say, he recognises matter of an "early" character, but thinks it may have been early Shakespeare. I do not share that view, which does not seem to consist with Mr. Wilson's own explanation of certain oversights as due to Shakespeare's slight acquaintance with the old play; but it is unnecessary in the present connection to do more than suggest that an early revision by Shakespeare—or, it may be, by another —of an older MUCH ADO, taken with the present thesis that he so revised a TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA by Greene, will completely elucidate the charge of Greene's champion.

The testimonies make it certain that Greene wrote a number of successful comedies in addition to the plays preserved under his name. What became of them? It would be in the ordinary way of theatrical enterprise that Shakespeare's company should secure some of them, as it undeniably secured the HENRY VI plays, and HAMLET, and the SPANISH TRAGEDY, and yet other successes of the past. The thesis, then, that it so secured

certain comedies of Greene, the acclaimed chief "comedian" of the time, is on the face of it highly probable; and there remains only the question of the validity of the proofs above offered.

That Shakespeare ever troubled himself about the charge that he had purloined the plumes of Greene is not compatible with my conception of him; and that he would have demurred to our rendering to Greene that which is Greene's I find equally unthinkable. Beside the splendour of his own singing-robes, these plumes, as seen in this play, are poor indeed. To remove from the canon this particular piece, which a good critic was willing to put aside in the day of George the Second, will but relieve the canon of an anomaly and leave his supremacy the more unquestionable.

NOTE ON LAUNCE

There will doubtless be a disposition among students to concur with the latest editors in finding Launce a more "Shakespearean" personage than Speed, and to see in him, accordingly, one of Shakespeare's contributions to the play. It is not a great matter; but I would offer instead the suggestion that Launce and his dog may have been contributed to Greene's play by Nashe. The passage in the GROATSWORTH OF WIT referring to "young Juvenall, that byting Satyrist, that lastlie with mee together writ a Comedie," has given rise to much debate, some (with Fleay) arguing that the reference must be to Lodge, who collaborated with Greene in the LOOKING-GLASS FOR LONDON, while others retort that the further apostrophe to "young Juvenall" as "sweete boye" could not be addressed to Lodge, who was at least as old as Greene, whereas it would well fit Nashe, who was actually addressed as "gallant young Juvenal," by Meres, and was decidedly more of a "biting satirist" than Lodge.

But what comedy did Nashe write with Greene? There is no record of any; and after Greene's death Nashe, saying nothing of the "young Juvenal" allusion in the GROATSWORTH, denied that he had been "Greene's companion for anything more than a carouse or two," and yet again declared that after their first acquaintance he had "been two years together and not seen him."[1] Nevertheless, in 1596 he wrote retrospectively of Greene as "subscribing to me in everything but plotting plays, wherein he was his craft's master."[2] This clearly implies some intimacy; and it has occurred to me that their play-writing connection might very well have been over Greene's

[1] Works, ed. McKerrow, i, 303, 330.
[2] HAVE WITH YOU; Works, iii, 132.

drafting of the Two Gentlemen, which must belong to the last year of his life.

The merit imputed to Launce as compared with Speed is in virtue of his portraiture of his dog. Apart from that, he appears to have been drafted by Greene, on the lines of Speed. Professor Bradley, a throned authority on such an issue, finds Shakespeare deficient in his appreciation of the dog; and who shall gainsay him? Now Nashe, on the other hand, has said more in discriminating praise of the dog than any Elizabethan I can call to mind. We know not what may have been the purport of this lost play, The Isle of Dogs; but in Summer's Last Will and Testament there are over four pages (Works, III, 254-8) of verse and prose concerning the friend of man, which suggest that he may very well have been the penman of Launce's discourses in our play. No one who has read him will deny that he had all the humour necessary. And if that be the sum of his collaboration with Greene, we can understand at once his refusal to rank as a close comrade and Greene's complimentary account of him as a collaborator. The addition of Launce's account of the dog to Greene's expositions of the points of a woman and the points of a horse would be an easy task for Nashe.

II

THE AUTHORSHIP OF "RICHARD II"

I. The General Problem

"This play," wrote Dr. Johnson, "is one of those which Shakespeare has apparently revised." Upon which Malone comments: "The notion that Shakespeare revised this play, though it has long prevailed,[1] appears to me extremely doubtful; or, to speak more plainly, I do not believe it."[2] In his preliminary remarks, also, he declares that the play "in my opinion bears the stamp of the poet's hand as evidently as any he ever wrote." And again, in his preliminary remarks on The Comedy of Errors, he asks: "Who that has carefully studied our poet's works, and is well acquainted with his style of writing and manner of thinking, can for a moment doubt that the admirable tragedy of King Richard the Second was the entire production of Shakespeare?"—proceeding to pass the same judgment on the Two Gentlemen, the Labour, and the Errors. For this pronouncement, however, Malone offers no critical justification. He refers us[3] for his reasons concerning Richard II to his "Attempt to ascertain the Order of Shakespeare's Plays"; but the argument there is merely to the effect that the play given at the request of Sir Gilly Merrick and others on the eve of the insurrection of Essex in 1601 was an old one entitled Henry IV, of prior date to Shakespeare's. The implication appears

[1] Pope had supposed some of the rhymed matter to be non-Shakespearean.
[2] Var. Ed. note at end of play.
[3] Prelim. Remarks on Richard II, and note at end.

to be that Shakespeare's play, being *ex hypothesi* differently constructed, is to be presumed original.

As no such inference is really carried by the data, we must seek independently for grounds of judgment in the style and technique of our play, so much of which is in literary quality below the level of KING JOHN, commonly dated within a year of it. Fleay, who in his MANUAL (p. 26) first accepted Tyrwhitt's and Malone's view that the play called for by the Essex conspirators was an old HENRY IV, and then in a note (p. 57) adopted Professor Hales's view that it had really been Shakespeare's RICHARD II, pronounced that to be "certainly Shakespeare's." He dates it *circa* 1595; putting JOHN and the MERCHANT *circa* 1596; and in the LIFE he maintains that RICHARD II is recognised by all competent critics as Shakespeare's earliest historical play.[1]

Early it must certainly be by the style test, if it be really Shakespeare's. Wright pronounces concerning KING JOHN that "if we may trust the evidences of style, language and metre, it is probable that we may be not very far wrong in placing it near RICHARD II, perhaps rather before than after it, and therefore about the year 1593, or at any rate in the period 1593-4." Here we note the usual disregard of Shakespeare's own declaration that the VENUS AND ADONIS was the "first heir of his invention." He could not indeed have claimed JOHN to be of his "invention," that play being but a re-writing of the older TROUBLESOME RAIGNE, with no innovation in plot. But RICHARD II raises the same challenge. In point both of style and of ideation it is for the most part wholly Marlovian, distinctly inferior to JOHN, and on that score to be placed before and not after it, if we are to reckon it substantially Shakespeare's. In point of versification it stands fifth in percentage of double-endings (11·8) in Fleay's count, coming before the ERRORS. This agrees substantially with König's count (11·0). JOHN, on the other hand, has only some 6 per

[1] Page 187. So in MANUAL, p. 27; though there KING JOHN is also pronounced the first historical play, properly so called, among Shakespeare's works. Malone reckoned RICHARD II the first Shakespearean tragedy.

cent.; though its percentage of rhyme is only 4·5 to the 18·6 of RICHARD. Yet RICHARD is the lower in its percentage of speech-endings on short lines (7·3; standing mid-way between the TWO GENTLEMEN, 5·8, and the LABOUR, 10·0) as compared with JOHN, which has 12·7. That is to say, JOHN is in respect of its double-endings earlier, and in respect of its speech-endings and its small quantity of rhyme later in its characteristics than RICHARD. But the latter play contains by far the larger amount of weak and turgid verse, some of it markedly archaic. Is it then a play of Shakespeare's invention?

Professor Bradley, who unfortunately has not produced any special study of the play,[1] makes many allusions to it as an obviously early work of Shakespeare. Of Antony he writes[2] that, "Like Richard II, he sees his own fall with the eyes of a poet, but a poet much greater than the young Shakespeare, who could never have written Antony's marvellous speech about the sunset clouds." And again, in his excellent essay on "Shakespeare the Man,"[3] he says of RICHARD II that it "seems to be clearly his [Shakespeare's] first attempt to write historical tragedy *in a manner entirely his own*." And a no less authoritative critic, Mr. Mackail, has written[4] that "Shakespeare, after retouching other playwrights and collaborating with Marlowe, carries forward the series *unassisted* in RICHARD II and RICHARD III."

I will not at this point detail arguments to the contrary, but simply note that the number and status of the

[1] If he had, he would not, I think, have accepted as he has done the universal mis-reading established by mis-punctuation of the lines (II, i):

> "The setting sun, and music at the close,
> As the last taste of sweets, *is sweetest last*."

The true reading, surely, is:

> —As the last taste of sweets is sweetest—last
> Writ in remembrance more than things long past.

As the lines are hitherto pointed, *writ* has no construction, and the lines no total syntax. *Last* is a verb, not an adverb. But I have met with no edition which recognises this.

[2] OXFORD LECTURES ON POETRY, p. 295.

[3] Id., p. 322.

[4] Brit. Acad. Lect. on SHAKESPEARE AFTER THREE HUNDRED YEARS, 1916, p. 13.

critics who recognise and dwell upon a Marlowe "influence" in the play is so great as to suggest that the eminent critics just cited—who cannot be supposed to be merely echoing Malone—had present to their minds solely the non-Marlovian elements or items in it, and that they failed to recall the many others which are commonly recognised as markedly Marlovian. I cannot suppose that, on challenge, they would dispute these Marlovian characteristics—putting the matter simply at that, without debating actual authorship—any more than they would deny that, assuming RICHARD II to have been penned by Shakespeare, its very theme was suggested by EDWARD II, and its treatment of the abdicating King largely modelled on that of the other. That there are distinct differences between the plays is not to be disputed. But that RICHARD II is an attempt by Shakespeare to write a historical play in a manner entirely his own is, I conceive, an *obiter dictum* rather than a considered opinion; and that Mr. Mackail would deny an obvious Marlowe "influence" in RICHARD III I cannot believe.

Coleridge pronounces RICHARD II "the most admirable of Shakespeare's historical plays," a prodigy of criticism which may be left to balance with the censure of Swinburne. Their conflict is a monition to the student to work to his conclusions for himself, seeing that the two poets, alike gifted impressionists and alike steeped in Shakespeare, cancel each the other's oracle. Neither entertains the notion of mixed authorship. Swinburne, finding the play substantially inferior to Marlowe's EDWARD II, on which it is for him "undoubtedly" modelled, accounts for it as an exercise in imitation. Concerning the scene in which York denounces and the duchess shields their son, he pronounces that

> "It would be easy, agreeable, and irrational to ascribe without further evidence than its badness this misconceived and misshapen scene to some other hand than Shakespeare's. It is below the weakest, the hastiest, the rudest scene attributable to Marlowe; it is false, wrong, artificial beyond the worst of his bad and boyish work; but it has a certain likeness for the worse to the crudest work of Shakespeare.

It is difficult to say to what depths of bad taste the writer of certain passages in VENUS AND ADONIS could not fall before his genius or his judgment was full-grown. To invent an earlier play on the subject and imagine this scene a surviving fragment, a floating waif of that imaginary wreck, would in my opinion be an uncritical mode of evading the question at issue. It must be regarded as the last hysterical struggle of rhyme to maintain its place in tragedy . . . ."[1]

There follows an unintelligible "explanation" or "excuse" for such a struggle, to the effect that "the poet was not yet dramatist enough" to do equal justice to all his characters—as if that were a state of development provocative of rhyme. On this head it may here suffice to say (1) that Swinburne's theory of "a final relapse into rhyme and rhyming epigram, into the 'jigging vein' dried up (we might have hoped) long since by the very glance of Marlowe's Apollonian scorn,"[2] is a misconceiving judgment. Marlowe never vetoed rhyme in drama. It is indeed a not unnatural surmise from his phrase, "jigging veins of rhyming mother wits," that he was jeering at *all* rhyme in drama; but it is a hasty inference. The high probability is that he was merely girding at archaic jingle like the old 'fourteeners' (alternates of twelve and fourteen syllables, the latter resolvable into two of eight and six syllables), in which so many of the old plays were penned. To verse of that loosely-strung kind the description of "jigging" was specially given.[3] As Marlowe not only wrote thousands of lines in rhyming couplets, but often introduced such couplets into his own plays, there is no real warrant for supposing him to regard them as matter for mere scorn in drama. And we shall perhaps see reason to conclude that he actually experimented freely in the form. As for (2) the episode of Aumerle's pardon, which certainly has the air of an addition, the suggestion that it is a product of the bad taste of the young Shakespeare may be safely put

[1] A STUDY OF SHAKESPEARE, ed. 1918, pp. 40-41.

[2] The dictum is repeated in Swinburne's posthumous monograph, SHAKESPEARE, 1909, p. 12.

[3] Compare the "jig" cited in EDWARD II, II, ii, 187; and "their vild, uncivil, skipping jigs," in EDWARD III, I, ii, 12. Samples of "jigging" verse are given by Malone at the end of THE COMEDY OF ERRORS in the Variorum edition.

aside. The rhyme is of the order of most of the other couplet work in the play, which is *not* Shakespearean; and the inept quibbling over the word 'pardon' is still less so. The problem is not thus to be disposed of.

Recent criticism has on the whole flinched alike from Malone's and from Coleridge's and Swinburne's positions. Already in 1858, Richard Grant White was surmising the presence of another hand. Sir Henry Newbolt, indeed, in his studious introduction to the Oxford edition of 1912, is content to insist only on the immaturity of the work, making no suggestion of any pre-Shakespearean or non-Shakespearean element. Swinburne, disliking the play as a whole, pronounces the rhymed matter to be written under the influence of Greene as against the influence of Marlowe, seen (later) in RICHARD III. But Mr. Ivor B. John, in the "Arden" edition, is moved, Swinburne notwithstanding, to suggest that there may have been a previous play, wrought over by Shakespeare; and even Professor Saintsbury concedes that "it would not be wise to assume *too* absolutely" that RICHARD II is "*quite* original"; intimating further[1] that it may be classed with TITUS, as "exhibiting the Marlowe influence more strongly than anything else, save some parts of HENRY VI"—an odd pronouncement in view of RICHARD III, which the Professor and Swinburne alike assign to Shakespeare; and an interesting contradiction of that of Swinburne on RICHARD II.

A very strong ground for inferring a previous play is pointed out by Mr. Ivor B. John in his introduction to the "Arden" edition of the play. As in KING JOHN two matters—the reason for Faulconbridge's hatred of the Dauphin and the motive for the poisoning of the king—are left unexplained by Shakespeare though they are made quite clear in the TROUBLESOME RAIGNE, so in RICHARD II York's allusion (III, i, 167) to the "prevention of poor Bolingbroke about his marriage" is left unexplained, and is never again mentioned. It is fair to say with Mr. John that "this slip in RICHARD II looks

[1] CAMBRIDGE HIST. OF ENG. LIT., v. 184-5.

remarkably like evidence that Shakespeare was working over an older play as he did in the case of the contemporary KING JOHN."[1] But neither Mr. John nor any other recent editor has attempted any such examination of the style throughout RICHARD II as should properly follow upon such a hypothesis. Mr. John animadverts upon "two horrible couplets" (I, ii, 73-4; iv, 308-9), expressing a "hope that these are but fifth-rate curtain-gags, preserved by some strange mischance." But this is a quite inadequate notation of the style-problem. Equally "horrible" couplets (e.g., the rhyme of *labour* and *favour* in the closing speech) are left unnoticed, with the mass of more or less turgid Marlovian verse, early and late, which denies the hand of Shakespeare, early or late.

The problem may be broadly realised when we contrast an obviously genuine Shakespearean passage with a number of others. Take, for instance, this (III, ii, 160-170):—

> Within the hollow crown
> That rounds the mortal temples of a king
> Keeps Death his court, and there the antick sits,
> Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp;
> Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
> To monarchize, be fear'd, and kill with looks,
> Infusing him with self and vain conceit,
> As if this flesh which walls about our life
> Were brass impregnable; and, humour'd thus,
> Comes at the last, and with a little pin
> Bores through the castle wall, and farewell king!

There can be small question that that verse is Shakespeare's even if it be a re-writing of another man's (for we have "Thou antic Death" in 1 HENRY VI (IV, vii, 18) in matter which cannot be Shakespeare's): it is the old

[1] Introd. cited, p. xi. Mr. John might have added that the strangely heedless disregard of time shown in II, i, where, as he notes, Bolingbroke is announced as *returning* to England when he has not even had one clear day to get away, is evidence of a hasty reconstruction, whether by the original draftsman or a reviser. And if Shakespeare could be as heedless as this in an early attempt to compete with Marlowe, he becomes for us a mystery indeed. He certainly does too often "annihilate time" in his revisions; but he cannot conceivably have *planned* a play so wildly when he was striving to make a reputation.

story of the violin against the brass. The earlier lines:

> For God's sake let us sit upon the ground
> And tell sad stories of the death of Kings,

point to two in Peele's OLD WIVE'S TALE:—

> Now sit thee here, and tell a heavy tale,
> Sad in thy mood, and sober in thy cheer;

as well as to one in TITUS (III, ii, 83):—

> Sad stories chanced in the times of old;

and suggest, as do other passages in other scenes, that Shakespeare may have been re-writing a Peele or a Marlowe speech; but the manner and the matter have become his own, and the lines first cited are rhythmically impossible for any of his early corrivals.

Early matter it is, for him: there is not one double-ending in the thirty-six lines of the speech. But in other scenes we not only have rhymed matter far inferior in diction to the VENUS, but blank-verse matter of equally inferior quality, yet often exhibiting a percentage of double-endings higher than Shakespeare reaches in unquestioned work till after the MERCHANT. By no editor or critic does this anomaly—common to so many of the early plays—appear to have been faced. And even in passages which good editors have highly praised we find verse of a character essentially different from that above quoted, verse which is either pre-Shakespearean or from the hand of one of his lesser rivals of the early-middle period. In comparing one such sample with a closely similar speech from JULIUS CÆSAR we shall see at once the weakness of the chronology which dates JULIUS CÆSAR 1599 or later and RICHARD II about 1593, and the reason for recognizing in both plays a pre-Shakespearean structure. The longer of the two speeches of the Bishop of Carlisle in Act IV, scene i, pronounced by Sir Henry Newbolt "magnificent," contains these lines:—

> And if you crown him [Hereford] let me prophesy,
> The blood of English shall manure the ground,
> And future ages groan for this foul act;
> Peace shall go sleep with Turks and infidels,
> And in this seat of peace tumultuous wars

Shall kin with kin and kind with kind confound;
Disorder, horror, fear and mutiny
Shall here inhabit, and this land be call'd
The field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls.
O! if you raise this house against this house,
It will the woefullest division prove
That ever fell upon this cursèd earth.
Prevent it, resist it, *let it not be so*,
Lest child,[1] child's children, cry against you 'woe!'

This ought to be compared with the closely kindred prophecy of Antony in JULIUS CÆSAR (III, i, 259-76):—

Woe to the land that shed this costly blood!
Over thy wounds now do I prophesy,—
Which, like dumb mouths, do ope their ruby lips,
To beg the voice and utterance of my tongue—
A curse shall light upon the limbs of men;
Domestic fury and fierce civil strife
Shall cumber all the parts of Italy;
Blood and destruction shall be *so in use*,
And dreadful objects so familiar,
That mothers shall but smile when they behold
Their infants quarter'd with the hands of war;
All pity choked with custom of fell deeds:
And Cæsar's spirit, ranging for revenge,
With Até by his side come hot from hell,
Shall in these confines with a monarch's voice
Cry 'Havoc,' and let slip the dogs of war;
That this foul deed shall smell above the earth
With carrion men, groaning for burial.

These passages, so similar in matter and manner, so akin in their inequality of diction, pass current alike as certainly Shakespeare's. But if Shakespeare wrote the first about 1593, is it conceivable that he so absolutely imitated it, in matter and manner, in 1599, the earliest date assigned by orthodox criticism to JULIUS? If he ever wrote in that manner, did he still write so in 1599?

Those who are prepared to admit that this is so unlikely as to be nearly incredible[2] will recognise that a

[1] Grant White emends: "children's children," probably rightly.

[2] One of the points at which orthodoxy most dishonours Shakespeare is the ascription to him of what we may term duplicate scenes, as those of the Bolingbroke quarrel and the Aumerle quarrel in RICHARD II, and the two wooing scenes in RICHARD III. If all from one hand, these are the output of a vamper. That the duplication in RICHARD II is the work of one hasty and hard-pressed playwright, and that in RICHARD III a resort by a second to the same order of repetitive art, seems the probable solution.

solution is not reached by merely assigning the JULIUS speech to the same year with RICHARD II. The *duplication* by Shakespeare at that stage would be just as unlikely; and the style is certainly *not* the style of the unquestionable speech of Richard before quoted. All three speeches, indeed, lack double endings, and are thus alike presumptively early; but the twin prophecies are alike wholly different in *timbre*, in movement, in rhythm, in quality of diction, from the speech on death and Kings. That, further, is vivid poetry; these are in comparison but vigorous rhetoric. The student of style, going no further, will say that the poetry is Shakespeare's, the rhetoric from another hand. We have but to compare it with the speech of Pandulph "in a prophetic spirit" (JOHN, III, iv, 126) to realise how profoundly different is the mere rhetoric of Shakespeare from this, early or late.

And this difference holds of much more of the blank verse of RICHARD II. In the opening scene the diction is often on a very familiar pre-Shakespearean plane—the average plane of Marlowe in his chronicle plays.[1] For instance:—

> *Boling.* First, heaven be the record of my speech!
> In the devotion of a subject's love,
> Tendering the precious safety of my prince,
> And free from other misbegotten hate,
> Come I appellant to this princely presence.
> Now, Thomas Mowbray, do I turn to thee,
> And mark my greeting well, for what I speak
> My body shall make good upon this earth,
> Or my divine soul answer it in heaven.
> Thou art a traitor and a miscreant,
> Too good to be so, and too bad to live,
> Since the more fair and crystal is the sky
> The uglier seem the clouds that in it fly.[2]
>
> *Once more, the more to aggravate the note,*
> *With a foul traitor's name stuff I thy throat,*
> And wish, so please my sovereign, ere I move
> What my tongue speaks, my right-drawn sword may prove.

[1] That is, not only EDWARD II but those in which he must be admitted to have shared—EDWARD III and RICHARD DUKE OF YORK—to say nothing, for the moment, of 1 HENRY VI.

[2] It may be worth while to note, as particularly un-Shakespearean, the singular intellectual ineptitude of this trope.

Mow. Let not my cold words here accuse my zeal . . .
First, the fair reverence of your highness curbs me
From giving reins and spurs to my free speech;
Which else would post until it had return'd
These terms of treason doubled down his throat . . . .
I do defy him, and do spit at him;
Call him a slanderous coward and a villain:
Which to maintain I would allow him odds,
And meet him, were I tied to run afoot
Even to the frozen ridges of the Alps,
Or any other ground inhabitable,
Where ever Englishman durst set his foot . . . .[1]

Compare Marlowe's EDWARD II, iv, ii:—

Ah, sweet Sir John, even to the *utmost verge*
Of Europe, on the shores of Tanais.

We have

the *furthest verge*
That ever was surveyed by English eye,

in our play, I, i, 93.

Mow. Then Bolingbroke, as low as to thy heart,
Through the false passage of thy throat, thou liest.
Three parts of that receipt I had for Calais
Disbursed I duly to his highness' soldiers;
The other part reserved I by consent . . . .
Now swallow down that lie. For Gloucester's death,
I slew him not, but to my own disgrace
Neglected my sworn duty in that case . . . .
This is my fault; as for the rest appeal'd,
It issues from the rancour of a villain,
A recreant and most degenerate traitor . . . .
K. Rich. Wrath-kindled gentlemen, be rul'd by me;
Let's purge this choler without letting blood:
This we prescribe, though no physician;
Deep malice makes too deep incision:
Forget, forgive, conclude and be agreed:
Our doctors say this is no month to bleed.

This, whatever some critics may say, is in the average "chronicle" manner of Marlowe, though not noticeably above the more energetic work of others who learned in

[1] Here again we have the movement and the rhetoric of the archaic parts of JULIUS CÆSAR (v, iii, 48):—

O Cassius!
Far from this country Pandarus shall run,
Where never Roman shall take note of him.

his school. Peele, for instance, at times comes near it, if all of EDWARD I be his:—

> *Lluellen.* Why, Longshanks, think'st thou I'll be
> scar'd with words!
> No: did'st thou speak in thunder like to Jove,
> Or should'st, like Briarēus, shake at once
> A hundred bloody swords with bloody hands,
> I tell thee, Longshanks, here he faceth thee
> Whom nought can daunt, no, not the stroke of death.
> Resolv'd, ye see; but see the chance of war:
> Know'st thou a traitor an thou see'st his head?
> Then, Longshanks, look this villain in the face:
> This rebel, he hath wrought his country's wrack;
> Base rascal, bad, and hated in his kind,
> Object of wrath, and subject of revenge.
>
> Peele's EDWARD I, sc. 4
> (Dyce's GREENE AND PEELE, p. 388*a*).

But a difficulty is at once set up by the fact that Peele many times echoes Marlowe, in lines and passages; and that Marlowe once or twice seems to echo Peele. As Mr. Verity has pointed out, the line in THE JEW OF MALTA (III, ii, 33):—

> And with my prayers pierce impartial heavens,

copies one (III, i, 115) in Peele's ARRAIGNMENT OF PARIS:

> For Paris fault pierced th' impartial skies,

which antedates all Marlowe's dramatic work. There arises, however, the double difficulty that the Governor's speech in the JEW is partly unlike Marlowe, and that indeed the whole scene has a somewhat spurious air, and may be a contribution by Peele or another. In EDWARD II there is a similar parallel; the line

> To appease the wrath of their offended King

(III, iii, 25) recalling Peele's

> T'appease the anger of the angry heavens
>
> (ARRAIGNMENT, prol. l. 14);

while a later line (57) in the same scene,

> It is but temporal that thou canst inflict,

doubles one in Peele's EDWARD I (Dyce, p. 388*b*):—

> It is but temporal that you can inflict.

And though there may fairly be raised the question whether Marlowe did not contribute a little to EDWARD I (for instance, in Queen Elinor's speech in the opening scene, beginning "Now Elinor, now England's lovely queen") this line occurs in a speech quite in Peele's ordinary manner. Which, then, was the copyist? It is commonly held that EDWARD II was one of Marlowe's latest plays, and subsequent to EDWARD I (printed 1593: datable years earlier); but this is far from certain. And when we note in RICHARD II the line (III, ii, 94):

> The worst is worldly loss thou canst unfold,

in a passage more like Marlowe than Peele, the problem remains thus far baffling. For Marlowe, like his corrivals, was much given to echoing his own phrases;[1] while Peele certainly echoes him much more frequently than he seems to echo Peele. When then we find in the most praised passage in our play what seem to be echoes, on a higher poetic plane, of the matter of Peele, we must consider warily whether the revising or transmuting hand of Shakespeare has worked strongly on original matter by Peele or on something of Marlowe's which Peele has elsewhere been echoing. Let us compare:—

> *An ancient seat of Kings*, a second Troy,
> Y-compassed round with a commodious sea:
> Her people are y'cleped Angeli,
> Or, if I miss, a letter is the most.
>
> ARRAIGNMENT OF PARIS (1584), v, i.

> Illustrious England, *ancient seat of Kings*
> Whose chivalry hath royaliz'd thy fame,
> That sounding bravely through terrestrial vale,
> Proclaiming conquests, spoils, and victories,
> Rings glorious echoes through the farthest world . . . .
> Her neighbour realms, as Scotland, Denmark, France,
> *Awed with her deeds and zealous of her arms*,
> Have begg'd defensive and offensive leagues . . .
>
> EDWARD I, sc. i.

[1] See, for instance, in the JEW, these lines:—

> *As* one of them [precious stones] indifferently rated (I, i)
> Had they been valued at indifferent rate (I, ii);
> *As*, be it [a pearl] valued but indifferently (v, iii).

The matter is further dealt with hereinafter.

Were every ship ten thousand on the seas,
Mann'd with the strength of all the eastern Kings,
Conveying all the monarchs of the world,
T' invade the island where her highness reigns,
'Twere all in vain . . . .
The wallowing ocean hems her round about
Whose raging floods do swallow up her foes . . .
Securely guard the west part of her isle;
The south the narrow Britain-sea begirts . . . .
The German seas along the east do run . . .

BATTLE OF ALCAZAR, II, iv.

These British lions, rampant in the field,
That never learn'd in battle's rage to yield,
Breathe terror to the proud usurping foe,
Ranging the world, commanding where they go . . . .

DESCENSUS ASTRÆÆ (1591).

Elizabeth, great empress of the world,
Britannia's Atlas, star of England's globe,
That sways the massy *sceptre* of her land
And holds the royal reins of Albion.

POLYHYMNIA (1590).

Elizabeth, anointed of the Highest,
To sit upon her kingly father's seat,
And wear in honour England's diadem
To sway that massy *sceptre* and that sword
That aw'd the world in his triumphant hand
And now in hers commands the enemy,
And with dishonour drives the daring foe
Back to his den.

ANGLORUM FERIÆ (1595).

Thus the leading themes in Gaunt's speech, the "royal throne of Kings," the "scepter'd isle," the guarding sea, the envy of other lands, the renown of England's Kings throughout the world—all are itemized by Peele; and the reiterations, culminating in:

This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England . . .
This land of such dear souls, this dear, dear land,

belong broadly to his manner:—

Proclaim the day of England's happiness,
The days of peace, the days of quietness,
And let her gladsome birthday be the first,
Her day of birth, beginning of our bliss;
Set down the day in characters of gold,
And mark it with a stone as white as milk,
That cheerful sunny day.

ANGLORUM FERIÆ.

Yet again, the line in RICHARD II (I, i, 34):—

> Come I appellant to this princely presence,

points in the same way to

> A mortal man amidst this heavenly presence,

in Peele's ARRAIGNMENT OF PARIS (IV, ii); a formula which is thrice repeated in THE TROUBLESOME RAIGNE OF KING JOHN, in scenes that seem certainly assignable to Peele:—

> Nor mad, nor maz'd, but well advised, I
> Charge thee before this royal presence here.
> (Rep. in Sh. Lib., v, 229.)

> And all *this princely presence* shall confess.
> *Id., ib.*

> Philip, 'tis thine, and 'fore *this princely presence*
> Madam, I humbly lay it at your feet.
> *Id.*, p. 246 (II, iii).

When Peele is recognised as a main collaborator in the TROUBLESOME RAIGNE, his participation in RICHARD II is seen to be primarily more likely; and the careful investigation of Mr. Dugdale Sykes, while it does not bear out the claim for Peele as sole author of the RAIGNE, establishes his presence at the outset, and largely throughout.[1] "Nor mad nor maz'd," as it happens, is one of his formulas.[2]

But Marlowe, too, had plenty of normal patriotism: his presence must, I think, be admitted in much of the matter in that kind in EDWARD III; and we must recognise the possibility that he may have put his hand to Gaunt's speech, even though we regard it as revised by Shakespeare. Indeed the scene as a whole suggests recasting, and even more than two hands: York's rhyming lines about "our tardy apish nation" recall neither Peele nor Shakespeare; and the transition in Gaunt's speech at the point:

> This royal throne of Kings, this scepter'd isle,

[1] See Mr. Sykes's SIDELIGHTS ON SHAKESPEARE, 1919, pp. 101-116.
[2] *Id.*, p.

is noticeably abrupt. We may note that the commonplace :

> For violent fires soon burn out themselves,

echoes Marlowe's

> Nothing violent,
> Oft have I heard tell, can be permanent.
> JEW OF MALTA, I, i.

And when we find such a verbal coincidence as

> When words are scarce, they're seldom spent in vain
> (RICHARD II, II, i, 7)

and

> For his oaths are seldom spent in vain
> (MASSACRE AT PARIS, l. 779),

we are moved to further inquiry.

Again, one of the words occurring only in this play in "Shakespeare" is the verb *abstains* (l. 76), and this occurs in Marlowe (HERO AND LEANDER, ii, 108). When, then, we note further that many other once-used words in the play are also traceable to him, the primary ground for asserting his presence—the admittedly Marlowese style of most of the play—is reinforced. Those raucous reiterations :—

> With a foul traitor's name stuff I thy throat . . . .
> These terms of treason doubled down his throat . . . .
> Through the false passage of thy throat, thou liest—

are as like Marlowe as they are unlike Shakespeare :—

> Down to the channels of your hateful throats.
> 2 TAMB., IV, iii.
>
> Tyrant, I turn the traitor in thy throat.
> *Id.*, V, I.
>
> Return it to their throats. EDWARD II, ii.
>
> Defiance, Frenchman? We rebound it back,
> Even to the bottom of thy master's throat.
> EDWARD III, I, i, 90.[1]

Not otherwise is it with these :—

> I do defy him and I spit at him. (I, i, 60).
> Spit it bleeding in his high disgrace. (I, i, 194).
> Spit upon him whilst I say he lies. (IV, i, 75).

[1] Compare 1 HENRY VI, II, iv, 76, and RICHARD III, I, ii, 93—both plainly Marlovian passages.

With which compare :

Spits in thy face [King John to King Edward]
EDWARD III, III, iii, 50.

Spit in 's face [Empress to Emperor]
ALPHONSUS OF GERMANY, V, 314.

To say that such hackneyed and crudely iterative declamation is entirely in the manner of Shakespeare is to arouse revolt in every student who discriminates between the genuine and the spurious in the early plays. Let us, then, without leaping to any conclusion, follow so salient a set of clues, and examine the whole case.

II. UNSHAKESPEAREAN ASPECTS.

The surmise of a non-Shakespearean origin for the play finds much implicit support, further, in many admissions by editors in their commentary. Clark and Wright make these :—

I, i, 85. *Inherit.* "This is the only passage of Shakespeare in which the verb 'inherit' is used in this sense, 'to put in possession.'"

I, iii, 82. *Adverse.* "Except in this passage Shakespeare always accentuates 'adverse' on the first syllable." [But the emendation is doubtful. The folio has 'amaz'd,' a corruption.]

I, iii, 136. *Merit*=reward. "The word does not appear to have been used by Shakespeare elsewhere in this sense."

I, iii, 174. "There appears to be no other instance of the word 'compassionate' used in the sense of having pity on oneself."

II, i, 49. *Less happier.* "The double comparative with 'more' is common enough. This is the only instance in Shakespeare with 'less.'"

II, iii, 29. "The metrical redundances and deficiencies of this play are so common that we are not justified in altering the text to mend the line."

The later Clarendon Press editors note more :—

I, iii, 258-62. "This stichomuthia [exchange of remarks of one line each] is in the manner of the 'University wits.'"

I, iii, 103. "Monosyllabic first foot." [A specialty of Marlowe's verse. See also II. 108, 110.]

I, iii, 196. *Sepúlchre*, with the Latin accent. The noun is elsewhere in Shakespeare 'sépulchre,' but the verb always 'sepúlchre.' [The noun 'sepúlchre' occurs in 2 TAMBURLAINE, I, iii, 196.]

III, ii, 42. "*Lords* is apparently dissyllabic: cf. II, iii, 99." [Common in Marlowe, never found in Shakespeare's unquestionable work.]

IV, i, 262. "Imitated from FAUSTUS, V, iv, 'Oh, soul, be changed to little water-drops.'"

IV, i, 281. "Another reminiscence of FAUSTUS, V, iii, 'Was this the face that launched a thousand ships?'"

V, i, 29-31. "Suggested by EDWARD II, V, i, 11-14."

These latter notations might have been multiplied. "Barbarism" (V, ii, 36) is rightly glossed: "barbarians —abstract for collective." It might have been added that "rough insulting barbarism," with this force, occurs in EDWARD III, I, ii, 9—a Marlowe passage.

And not only is there a multiplicity of such detail, suggesting an alien presence, generally Marlowe's: there is in the play a mass of matter, both in the blank-verse and in the rhymed, which in style never recalls Shakespeare at all; and it is the disregard of this aspect that puzzles one in the commenting of modern editors. A certain amount of matter raises doubt as to whether Shakespeare may or may not have retouched it. Richard's speech (V, v) which so crudely begins:—

> I have been studying how I may compare
> This prison, where I live, unto the world;
> And, *for because* the world is populous,
> And here is not a creature but myself,
> I cannot do it; *yet I'll hammer it out*,[1]

may be partly handled by him in its later lines; and the like may be doubtfully said of Act II and Act III, scene ii; but scene iii never hints of his presence; it is hard to find him in Act IV; and wheresoever he may have laid his hand in Act V it is certainly not in the final scene. That is so markedly inferior that the dismissal of it as merely

[1] Compare Marlowe:—

> And Barabas, now search this secret out;
> Summon thy senses; call thy wits together.
>
> JEW OF MALTA, I, i.

'prentice work for Shakespeare is fitly to be marked as a lapse into style-blindness—superinduced, doubtless, by the inattention which comes of unconsidered assent to tradition. Only such assent could prepare Sir Henry Newbolt to pass such matter without misgiving as merely faulty youthful work. Once for all, critics should realise that great poets fault in their own way, and not in the way of vampers or hacks or even over-worked laureates; that where they deliberately imitate they are not likely to outsink their models at the worst; and that the flat poverty of this scene is simply impossible for the Shakespeare who is held to have written his unquestionable lines in this play at the same period. His faults, early or late, are utterly different, as different as is the gait of the greyhound from that of the bulldog. Nor can this scene as a whole be conceivably a substitution for a cancelled earlier scene by him; it is at once early and poor work. To contrast the closing speech, in which Bolingbroke denounces his tool Exton, with that in which King John similarly deals with Hubert—a piece of work universally assigned to the same period—should be for any critic sufficient to reveal its utterly alien quality.

And it may be not unfitting here to comment on the unfortunate preference of our educational authorities for this play as a subject for school study and examination. The reason for the choice is obvious: it is a "suitable" historical play for schools in respect of its freedom from improprieties as compared with KING JOHN, where the illegitimate birth of Faulcombridge is made matter for jest. But in every other aspect it is thoroughly unsuitable. Here the pupil is presented with a set of styles in which that of Shakespeare only here and there emerges; and the juvenile taste in verse and in diction is either baffled or perverted by the obtrusion of a mass of poor blank verse and worse rhymed. The young reader is frequently offered commonplace and crudely inflated diction as the work of the Young Master—albeit with such caveats as those of Sir Henry Newbolt, which are apt to leave him wondering why, if things stand thus, he is called upon to study an immature performance as

a classic. Such a selection is to some extent an act of miseducation.

RICHARD II has not even general dramatic merit; and critics who contemn EDWARD II may fitly be challenged to defend this companion piece. That it is theatrically a poor play may be held to be in keeping with its early production. But it may also be a ground for doubt as to its origination. From the first, play-writing was a matter of business for Shakespeare; and his frequent resort, alike in comedy and in serious drama, to themes already handled on the stage, tells of practical preoccupation with the business of drawing audiences. This play, as we have it, makes (apart from the forced and irrelevant episode of Aumerle's treason to Bolingbroke in the fifth Act) only one notable appeal to popular interest—the staging of the doomed King, his folly, his weakness, his humiliation, and his deposition and death. Its duplicated quarrel-scenes are but railing-matches, on the common "chronicle" plane; and again and again it repeats phrases of Marlowe's in similar situations. It is plainly a parallel piece to Marlowe's EDWARD II; yet, though it bears comparison with that in its later evolution and catastrophe, it compares rather ill with it as to the exposition. Marlowe is indeed the most heedless of chronologists; but the feat of making Bolingbroke return from Brittany before he has gone there outgoes anything in EDWARD II. And while Marlowe's hand, rather doubtfully recognizable in some of the later scenes of EDWARD II, works freely and strongly in some of the earlier, the long opening scene of RICHARD is at once in the main un-Shakespearean as to diction and unsatisfactory as drama. All the structural faults of EDWARD II are paralleled here.

The action, unelucidated by any hints as to previous developments, is hardly intelligible. Mowbray and Bolingbroke propound their quarrel with prolixity and iteration; Richard poses in successive stages as a just and friendly arbitrator; then suddenly, in an ill-managed scene, in which the stage seems to be left empty during a "long flourish," he suddenly pronounces a savage and

malicious sentence of exile, which gives Bolingbroke his grievance with no apparent grounds in prior events. Only by the ensuing speeches is it suggested to us that the grounds are to be taken as lying in the King's fantastic caprice and reviving rancours. The enigma of Richard's lapse from prudent policy to violent autocracy is projected in an incomprehensible scene from a vague chronicle; and the attempts by loyal editors to find subtle insight in the flighty posing of the King serve but to force the question whether *such* psychology has either interest or instruction for young students.

Such an unsatisfying exposition is not only unlike Shakespeare at any stage : it is specially unlikely to have been of his origination in a play in which he was competing with Marlowe. If it was a trial of his powers he was trying them to small purpose. In JOHN he easily improves at each step on the old play he is re-writing, style and stagecraft keeping pace, despite one or two oversights. In sheer play of mind, as in its sustained level of diction, it is by far the superior performance. JOHN is thus, with the DREAM, the true starting point for the study of Shakespeare's serious style. Save for such an obvious patch as the herald's speeches at Angers, it is apparently his *writing* throughout, with that *cantabile* quality in which from the outset he reveals his uniqueness. In hearing of that, it seems sheer supererogation to dwell on the metrical differences which so immovably rebut the notion that Shakespeare can have written JOHN and RICHARD II and RICHARD III within some two years, declining to 6·3 per cent. of double-endings in JOHN and 5·1 in HENRY IV after reaching, as is assumed, 16·6 in the ERRORS, 18 and 20 in some scenes of RICHARD II, and 19·5 in RICHARD III, and mounting in a number of scenes in that play above 20. But as against the inertia of traditionist acquiescence the task must be carried on. Once more, the four-sided anomaly of the traditional Canon must be faced if we are to have a Canon worthy of the name; and RICHARD II is one of the outstanding positions to be dealt with.

III. The Old "Richard II"

The hypothesis of an early Richard II, in which probably Peele and Marlowe collaborated, Marlowe predominating—or which Peele retouched—is finally in full accord with all the evidence as to an early dramatic treatment of the subject.

Clarke and Wright, following the argument of Malone, pronounce concerning the piece commissioned by the Essex conspirators: "It is certain that this was not Shakespeare's play."[1] This assumes that Shakespeare's company had two plays on Richard II, both dealing with the subject of his deposition—a thing so unlikely that we must ask for strong evidence before believing it. And the evidence offered by Malone and other critics who share his view is extremely weak. The discussion of the problem, confused by Malone as by his predecessors, has remained so until now; and it is desirable that the issues should be cleared.

Farmer first drew attention to Camden's record that in the trial of Sir Gilly Merick and others of the Essex conspirators in 1601 it was charged on Merick:

> Quod exoletam tragœdiam de tragicâ abdicatione regis Ricardi Secundi in publico theatro coram conjuratis datâ pecuniâ agi curasset;

noting further Bacon's statement, in his Arraignment of Cuffe and Merick, that the latter, with a number of his companions,

> "had procured to be played before them the play of deposing King Richard the Second, where it was told him by one of the players that the play was old, and they should have loss in playing it, because few would come to it, there was forty shillings extraordinary given to play, and so thereupon played it was."

Suggesting that some of the rhymed parts of the play, which Pope thought to be non-Shakespearean, may have come from "the" old play, Farmer concludes by remarking that "the general tendency must have been very different, since, as Dr. Johnson observes, there are some expressions in this of Shakespeare, which strongly incul-

[1] Introd. to first Clarendon Press ed. of Richard II.

cate the doctrine of indefeasible right." The implication is that a play which suited the conspirators cannot have contained such doctrine. But it is plainly improbable in the highest degree that any play publicly acted in Elizabeth's reign would treat the deposition and execution of Richard as laudable or justifiable, save (as they are set forth in our play) from the standpoint of Bolingbroke's backers. Justification had not been offered in the case of Marlowe's EDWARD II. It sufficed for the conspirators that Richard had been formally deposed.

Tyrwhitt cites the further account of the trial of Merick given in the STATE TRIALS (VII, 60):—

> The story of Henry IV being set forth in a play, and in that play there being set forth the killing of the King upon a stage, the Friday before, Sir Gilly Merick and some others of the Earl's train having an humour to see a play, they must needs have THE PLAY OF HENRY IV. The players told them that was stale; they should get nothing by playing that; but no play else would serve; and Sir Gilly Merick gives forty shillings to Phillips the player to play this, besides whatsoever he could get.

Upon this Tyrwhitt concludes that the play "bore the title of HENRY IV, and not of RICHARD II," adding that it was certainly not Shakespeare's HENRY IV. Now, our RICHARD II is in large part a HENRY IV play, the bulk of Act v having reference to Henry's fortunes and not to Richard's. But on Tyrwhitt's view we are invited to believe that Shakespeare's company—for there is no dispute that the players were the Lord Chamberlain's men—had *three* different plays (or play sequences) concerning Henry IV; as on the other view it is assumed that they had two different plays on the fall of Richard II. But we actually possess the signed deposition of Augustine Phillipps, preserved in the State Paper Office,[1] and there the story is told of "the play of the deposing *and kyllynge* of Kyng Richard the Second,' and again of "that play of Kyng Richard." The surmise of yet another HENRY IV play is thus ruled out. Only in the late version of the episode in the State Trials is that title given.

[1] Reproduced by Dyce in introd. to the play.

Malone's reasoning, in turn, is so self-contradictory as to be finally unintelligible. "It may seem strange," he writes,[1] that the non-Shakespearean old play of his theory "should have been represented four years after Shakespeare's drama on the same subject had been printed: the reason undoubtedly was that in the old play the deposing King Richard II made a part of the exhibition; but in the first *edition* of our author's play, 154 lines describing a kind of trial of the King and his actual deposition in parliament, were *omitted*: *nor was it probably represented on the stage.* Merick, Cuffe, and the rest of Essex's train, naturally preferred the play in which his *deposition* was represented, their plot not aiming at the life of the Queen." Whereupon he proceeds to remark that the omitted scene, which other critics regarded as added to the play after its first production, was more probably "written with the rest, and suppressed in the printed copy of 1597." The natural comment is that the conspirators knew of the existence of the scene as formerly played, and commissioned the play chiefly on that account. But Malone stands finally committed to the otiose thesis that the Globe company had two plays on Richard II, in *both* of which there was a scene of the King's deposition; and that they played the non-Shakespearean one when they might as well have played the Shakespearean.

The matter is more carefully handled in Mr. Ivor B. John's edition of the play in the 'Arden' series; but there, too, the position taken up seems finally untenable. Recognizing that there are reasons for thinking that Shakespeare's RICHARD II, like his KING JOHN, was founded on a previous play, Mr. John yet adheres to the view that the piece commissioned by the Essex conspirators in 1601 was not that which we possess.[2] His reasons are, in substance, these:—

1. Phillipps testified that the play was "so old and so long out of use that they should have small company at

[1] Essay on the Chronological Order of the Plays; Var. Ed. 1821, ii, 325.
[2] Introd. to RICHARD II in ed. cited.

it." Shakespeare's play, being written not earlier than 1593, could hardly be so described in 1601, especially seeing that it had been printed in 1597 and 1598.

2. Our sympathies are in Shakespeare's play enlisted at the close for Richard; and Carlisle expressly forbids the deposition.

3. "The conspirators themselves disclaimed any attempt upon Elizabeth's life, and would therefore hardly countenance a play in which the monarch was murdered."

4. It appears from the title given that the play "did not deal with the death of Richard; had it done so, there surely would have been some mention of its more spicy contents in the title: it would have been the 'Life and Death of King Richard II' or 'The True Tragedie of King Richard II,' rather than, apparently, the mere mention of the deposition."

It will be at once seen that the third and fourth arguments are in conflict with the evidence.

(*a*) Camden specifies a *tragedy*, and without the killing there would have been no tragedy.

(*b*) It is inconceivable that any "final" play on Richard II would have omitted his death. But, further,

(*c*) We have the express words of Phillipps in his signed deposition: "the play of the deposing *and killing* of King Richard the Second." This decisive testimony Mr. John has overlooked. Noting it, we must either believe that Shakespeare's company had two plays representing the deposition and the murder of Richard, or admit that the play produced in 1601 was that which now passes as his, with the deposition scene included.

As to the contention that a play written or re-written about 1593 could not in 1601 be called "old and long out of use," it having been printed in 1597 and 1598, we must answer:

(*a*) that from the actors' point of view it *was* old, they being accustomed to produce a new play or two every year;

(*b*) that in all likelihood it *had* been "out of use," inasmuch as the omission of the deposition scene in the printed edition testifies to the disfavour with which it was naturally regarded at court:

(*c*) that the printing of the play (which is one of the "good" Quartos) rather tended, originally, to signify its disuse;

(*d*) that by Mr. John's own admissions our play is not improbably *based* on a pre-Shakespearean one, of which the main structure may have been retained; and

(*e*) that, even if these propositions be disputed, it must be admitted to have been Phillips's business to deny the drawing power of the play, in order to get a special payment for playing it And if the play was, as has been above contended, a revision or recast by Shakespeare of an older piece, dating from 1591 or 1592, the "old" was so much the more natural an expression for Phillips to use.

On every line of reasoning, then, we are shut up to the conclusion that the play revived for the Essex conspirators in 1601 was just the play we possess. That there was *one* other old acting play dealing with Richard II is indeed proved by the entry in the diary of the astrologer, Dr. Simon Forman,[1] mentioning a performance at the Globe theatre on April 10, 1611, of a play on Richard II which began with Wat Tyler's revolt. That play, as described by Forman, cannot be, as Fleay at first suggested, merely the old JACK STRAW (printed 1594) of which the blank verse portions are doubtless, as he opined, the work of Peele. Forman describes a historical play coming down just to the point at which our RICHARD II begins. But Forman's play may very well have been one based on the old JACK STRAW and on an intermediate play in which also Peele had a hand. As we have it, indeed, JACK STRAW has a highly truncated appearance, consisting as it does of only four Acts, which form an unusually short play. It has very much the air of being, like the old FAMOUS VICTORIES OF HENRY V, a

[1] Extract given in Knight's STUDIES OF SHAKESPEARE, p. 151.

simple actors' play to begin with,[1] the rustic characters speaking in a primitive "jigging" verse; while the royal and upper class characters speak in regular blank verse. An intermediate play dealing with the critical episodes of Richard's reign, as in Forman's account, may pretty confidently be inferred to have existed about the same time as the play on which our RICHARD II is based, being indeed, in the day of chronicle plays, a necessary preparation for that.

Seeing, however, that the published JACK STRAW, like the FAMOUS VICTORIES, is a very short piece (though capable of being eked out, like the other, with comic stage business), it was likely enough to be compressed into one or two Acts as the opening episode of a chronicle play on Richard II, preceding the tragedy of his deposition and death. Had Shakespeare done any work on the intermediate play, it would presumably have been preserved in the Folio like the other. We may infer, then, that he did not. The chronicle play would have little popular interest apart from the Jack Straw episode, which would be needed to give it "drawing" power. In Peele's hands, it would be a tissue of rather tedious blank-verse declamation.

While, however, it is obviously likely that Peele, setting out with JACK STRAW, would have a hand in such a chronicle play, it must be admitted that the plot of the intermediate play, as described by Forman, does not lead very sequently up to the existing tragedy. Lancaster, who dies in the odour of sanctity in our play, in Forman's account "privily contrived all villainy" against the King. We can but guess that Peele, always royalist in his sympathies, worked with others in an ill co-ordinated play, which served as a preliminary to the one recast by Shakespeare. That, as has often been noted, deals only with the last two years of the reign. It is thus quite improperly entitled in the Folio "The Life and Death" of Richard Second.

But if Shakespeare's company had come into posses-

[1] This might very well be dated, as Fleay suggested, 1587. Peele's part is probably later by some years.

sion of JACK STRAW and the chronicle play, they might very well combine these in one and run that and our play in a sequence, like the HENRY VI plays, with the Folio title. This would account for its being named "Richard II" by Forman. And some such explanation is actually needed to account for the Folio title, which is a change from that of the Quartos, where the wording is: "The Tragedie of King Richard the Second." The Folio title fits only a sequence in which there had been a "Life" play as well as a "Death" play.

A word may be added as to the so-called TRAGEDY OF KING RICHARD THE SECOND, privately printed from the sole MS. copy[1] by Halliwell-Phillipps in 1870 and published in more accurate form by Dr. Wolfgang Keller with an introduction in the German JAHRBUCH, vol. XXXV. The title given by Halliwell-Phillipps is really unwarranted, the MS. having none, and the tragedy involved being that of Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, Richard's uncle.

Halliwell-Phillipps, Keller, and Professor Schelling[2] are agreed in dating the play shortly before Shakespeare's; a decision which commits them to seeing in the RICHARD II line (II, i, 60):

> Like to a tenement or pelting farm,

a direct echo of one in the other play (V, i):

> Rent out our kingdom like a petty farme.

And so with the other echoes of phrase and idea noted by Keller. Seeing that (1) there is no evidence that the anonymous play was ever acted; that (2) it has runs of double-endings which suggest a later date than 1593; and that (3) it certainly has echoes of EDWARD II[3] and the CONTENTION, this is a hazardous assumption. But if it be made, it raises the question whether the anonymous play is in whole or in part the work of Peele, whose manner it frequently recalls; and that surmise tends to support the view that Peele had some share in our RICHARD II. Not otherwise does the anonymous play concern us in the present inquiry.

[1] Egerton MS. No. 1894.

[2] THE ENGLISH CHRONICLE PLAY, 1902, p. 108.

[3] As to these see the notes to the edition of Marlowe's play by Dr. Briggs.

IV. Our Play an Adaptation

All the data, in fine, point to the conclusion that our play is but an early and imperfect adaptation by Shakespeare of an older piece. As that piece does not separately exist, and our play is largely made up of archaic matter, we are entitled to conclude that Shakespeare has substantially preserved it in his adaptation. In the case of King John he had to re-write the whole, the earlier play being already printed (1591) and not in his company's possession.[1] Only by a complete re-writing, presumably, could he secure for them a copyright play on the subject. In the case of Richard II no such re-writing for copyright was necessary, and it has visibly not been attempted. The weak construction, the often inappropriate rhyming, the frequently forcible-feeble diction, the poor couplets at the end of scenes and speeches—all tell of a comparatively primitive original, imperfectly wrought over.[2] The concurrence of abundant rhyme with a much larger percentage of double-endings than that found in the much more carefully written yet undoubtedly early King John, points to the same conclusion. The double-endings, and much of the rhyming, point to other hands—much of the latter, presumptively, to the author of the Talbot scenes in 1 Henry VI, whosoever he may be (a problem to be faced later); the former ostensibly to Marlowe. If they are not Marlowe's, they are at least not Shakespeare's.

Shakespeare's clearly recognisable re-writing in the play is marked by a low proportion of double-endings—herein, however, chiming with some of the older matter.

[1] Mr. A. Acheson, in his Shakespeare's Lost Years in London, 1586-1592 (1920), puts an interesting theory of the causes which made such a play for the time popular.

[2] In one place (II, ii, 109) we have a plain trace of revision, ignored by editors. In the line:

If I know how or which way to order these affairs,

the " or which way " is clearly an alternative wording suggested by a corrector. The line " If I know how to order these affairs " is correct only if the *I* be stressed, which it might or might not be. If we substitute " which way " for " how " there is no need to stress the " I." But such a suggestion may have been made in the margin by another than Shakespeare. And after this point the passage becomes hopeless, and is so left.

In Richard's last soliloquy, which is primary, there are only five[1] to 66 lines—7.5 per cent., a little below the average of JOHN. In the 76 blank-verse lines of the first scene of the same Act there is no double-ending at all. In scene ii of Act III, again, where Richard does most of the speaking, the percentage is only 4·5. Broadly speaking, the King's speeches have been to some extent revised by the young Shakespeare throughout; and what is clearly his belongs to his earlier manner. On the other hand, the double-endings in the opening scene of the play number 25 to 101 lines of blank-verse; in the second scene they are 12·7 per cent.; and in the rest of the Act, 12 per cent. In scene i of Act II they fall to 10 per cent., rising in the second scene to 18, and in the third to 20.

As a broad progression in the use of double-endings admittedly marks Shakespeare's work as a whole, it might be surmised that these marked differences in metrical technique are the result of a re-handling of the play in different years—between, say, 1593 and 1597. But it will be found that the higher percentages do not concur with any better and riper writing: on the contrary, some of the low-percentage scenes in which the King does most of the speaking are of higher literary quality than some of the others; though it is not to be pretended that the quality varies regularly with the percentage. What does stand out is a difference of hands. The King-scenes on the whole substantially tell of youthful manipulation by Shakespeare, though not of his origination. They seem in fact to come within his first considerable effort in stagecraft in the serious vein. The scenes where double-endings multiply are not riper work by him, but the less-revised work of hands which already run to a considerable percentage of double-endings.

But mere scarcity of double-endings is not a certain mark of the presence of Shakespeare; neither is it sufficient ground for ascribing to Peele all matter which is non-Shakespearean. And so with the rhymed matter. On this side of the problem we have to reckon with the suggestion of Richard Grant White, who made a special

[1] Two of them made by the word "beggar."

investigation of the points of resemblance between the play and Daniel's poem, THE HISTORY OF THE CIVIL WARS. White was, I think, the first critic to suspect, after Malone's robustious negative, the presence of non-Shakespearean matter in the play; and it is after his discussion of Daniel that he writes :—

> "This play is quite unequal in style; and it seems to me not improbable that Shakespeare, according to the practice of his time, had some needless aid in writing it. It is possible that, as Daniel was engaged on the same subject at the same time, he not only talked over the subject with Shakespeare, but furnished him some of the rhymed passages; and from such an intercourse may have arisen the similarity between some passages in the play and in the first edition of the CIVIL WARS."[1]

This haphazard suggestion leaves us to make our own inquest, as usual. Before White wrote thus, Knight and Hudson had called attention to resemblances between the play and Daniel's poem which suggested an influence by one upon the other, Hudson holding that the passages were "so similar in thought and language as to argue that one of the authors must have drawn from the other." This raises the question whether Daniel may have intervened in the play. The points of contact are (1) the change made in Daniel's account (B. I, st. 62) of Mowbray's first resort to the King, as given in the second edition of his poem on the CIVIL WARS, published in the same year (1595) with the first; (2) the similar change made in the second edition of a new stanza (60) describing the wrangle between Norfolk and Bolingbroke in the King's presence; and (3) the introduction in the second edition of Bolingbroke's repudiation of Exton (B. III, st. 79), which did not appear in the first. All three points are valid. In the first edition the "faithless" Mowbray "insinuates" to the King against Bolingbroke, "perverting what was told"; in the second he simply "relates the whole discourse," and the King,

> Not conceiting it as it was told,
> But judging it proceeded out of hate . . . .
> Charged Hereford therewithal,

[1] Introd. to RICHARD II in White's Shakespeare, ed. 1889, vi, 144.

who thereupon quarrels with Mowbray, both before and at the scene in the lists. So, after Richard's death, the poet only in the second edition makes Bolingbroke denounce Exton, here conforming to the last speech in the play. The question is, Did Daniel simply follow the play at all three points, having seen it acted after issuing his first edition; or can it have been that he either partly re-modelled the play or moved the management to alter it in conformity with his own changes? The answer must be (1) that there is no clear sign of Daniel's style anywhere in the play, either in the blank verse or in the rhyme; and (2) that if the play was altered in deference to his poem after the appearance of its second edition the changes were not made by Shakespeare. On the other hand, (3) though Daniel, like Drayton and most of his contemporaries, was given to frank plagiarism, it seems hardly likely that he would alter his poem at three points to conform to an unprinted play, which was certainly on the boards before his first edition. The more natural presumption is that the play was altered between 1595 and 1597 in conformity with the poem. But the alterations are not at all in Shakespeare's style; and on that view the stronger becomes the conclusion that he did not originate it.

The rhyming speech at the close, in which Henry vituperates Exton for obeying him, very poor for Marlowe, seems too poor for Daniel. He was indeed perhaps not incapable of the rhyme of *labour* and *favour*, for he takes free license in these matters, rhyming *climates* with *limits* (CLEOPATRA, II, 1-3), and even *death* with *birth* (*id.* IV, 93-95); but he is always "well-languaged," and he could not, any more than Shakespeare, have written:

> Lords, I protest my soul is full of woe
> That blood should sprinkle me to make me grow:
> Come, mourn with me *for that I do lament* . . . .

The authors of the rhyming matter in RICHARD II are to be looked for elsewhere; and the author of the closing scene is either Marlowe at the end of his inspiration, heedlessly and vapidly echoing the conclusion of his own

EDWARD II, or a vamper left to do as much. To call it the work of Shakespeare is to charge him with sinking beneath all rivalry in that direction.

V. THE RHYMED MATTER

The first general verdict on the rhymed matter in RICHARD II is that much of it belongs to the poorer side of the play, and some of it to the poorest. But it is no easy matter to trace the authors. Kyd, Greene and Peele had all previously interlarded blank-verse plays with rhyme in this way, the fashion being set by Kyd[1] in the SPANISH TRAGEDY. Peele's ARRAIGNMENT OF PARIS is mainly in rhyme of different sorts, with a little blank-verse; and in EDWARD I he at points varies blank-verse with couplet rhyme. Of the three, he alone approximates much in manner to the couplet-work in RICHARD II. Kyd's couplet verse, indeed, is of the same line-ended quality—the normal characteristic of the English heroic couplet in that age and later. But his rhyming scene-sections (II, i, ii, iv, v), like his blank-verse, have a slower movement than that of the verse in RICHARD. Not to him, I think, are we ever led by the manner. Neither is Greene's couplet style in general like this, either in movement or in diction; though some of the couplet-work in ROMEO AND JULIET is so like him that it may be said to declare his influence. Swinburne's pronouncement, apparently accepted by Sir Henry Newbolt, to the effect that in RICHARD II Shakespeare is swaying towards Greene's influence, is on the other hand surprisingly wide of the mark. If we assume the play to be substantially Shakespeare's work, the Marlowe influence must be pronounced predominant alike in respect of the mass of Marlowesque blank-verse and of Marlowese diction and manner in the rhyme. On the other hand, if we are to suppose the bulk of the rhyming matter to be written by Shakespeare under the influence of Greene, we must

[1] Who had also introduced the stanza, much used later by Greene (S. T. II, ii, 12-17).

pronounce it a fiasco, since it is not Greenean, and much of it is actually below Greene's higher level. And that the young Shakespeare could thus fail is for some of us incredible. It is in the rhymed work of ROMEO, not in that of RICHARD, that we can see a Greene "influence,"[1] supposing the couplet matter in ROMEO to be all Shakespeare's, which is a very dubious proposition.

But, having seen strong reason at the outset to doubt Shakespeare's origination of RICHARD on general grounds, we are entitled to try another hypothesis than that of "influence." There is, in fact, no primary likelihood in the notion that Shakespeare, having recognised Marlowe's comparative success in the presentment of a failing and puling King in EDWARD II, would be likely to try his hand in rivalry by way of handling another failing and puling King, and in doing so to copy not only the treatment but the tags and tics of style, down to the crudest uses of expletive. It is just the kind of case in which genius would *not* be moved to a weak imitative rivalry; whereas on the other hand it is a case where the first poet might attempt a play upon lines on which he had partly succeeded, or where the hack-writer, especially with help from the first experimenter, would be likely to try his hand. For the group of chronicle-play-makers, Richard II was an obvious theme after Edward II had been exploited. When all is said, there is recognition among the most loyal Shakespeareans that in RICHARD II there has been no conspicuous advance on EDWARD II even in the presentment of the central character, and that, loose in structure as is Marlowe's play, this is at least no better.

Seeking inductively for the author of the bulk of the rhymed work in RICHARD, we note at the outset that it approximates closely in style and technique, if not in energy, to the rhyming Talbot scenes (?1592) in 1 HENRY VI, though also at times perhaps, in point of diction, to Peele's couplet-work in EDWARD I. But it is also closely akin to the couplet work in the first Act

[1] In the TWO GENTLEMEN, as is argued in the preceding essay, we have Greene's own work, little modified.

of the old TROUBLESOME RAIGNE OF KING JOHN. That (published 1591) is clearly an early play, in respect alike of its small proportion of double-endings and of its prologue, which places it soon after TAMBURLAINE; and while the opening appears to be Peele's, the hand of Marlowe seems to enter clearly though briefly in the Faulconbridge matter. He, then, may actually be one of the ringleaders in the practice of resort to rhyme as a variant in blank-verse drama. But the problem is not one to be lightly concluded upon, and I invite the student to approach it tentatively by way of a comparison of a number of style-samples, beginning with the resemblances to Greene in ROMEO :—

> O, mickle is the powerful grace that lies
> In herbs, plants, stones, and their true qualities;
> For nought so vile that on the Earth doth live
> But to the Earth some special good doth give;
> Nor aught so good but, strain'd from that fair use,
> Revolts from true birth, stumbling on abuse:
> Virtue itself turns vice, being unsupplied,
> And vice sometimes by action dignified.
>
> ROMEO AND JULIET, II, iii.

The obvious metrical characteristic of such lines is that they elude the monotony of a strictly regular scansion, the stresses and cæsuras varying lightly in every line. Not one gives a strict succession of five clear iambs: the feet are interfluent. Now though Greene, as has been noted in the previous study, abounds in monotonous iambic lines, he at times reaches the kind of variety under notice :—

> Fair Ida, might you choose the greatest good,
> Midst all the world in blessings that abound,
> Wherein, my daughter, should your liking be?
> Not in delight, or pomp, or majesty.
> And why?
> Since these are means to draw the mind
> From perfect good, and make true judgment blind.
> Might you have wealth and Fortune's richest store?
> Yet would I, might I choose, be honest poor;
> For she that sits at Fortune's feet a-low
> Is sure she shall not taste a further woe. . . .

The couplets in the Talbot scenes, on the other hand, are marked by a relative rigidity, albeit by a greater energy of phrase: strict iambic lines are frequent; the

cæsura usually falls after the second or third foot; and the stresses fall monotonously, as here :—

To tutor thee | in stratagems of war . . .
When sapless age | and weak unable limbs . . .
Your loss is great, | so your regard should be;
My worth unknown, | no loss is known in me.
Upon my death | the French can little boast :
In yours they will, | in you all hopes are lost . . . .
On that advantage, bought with such a shame,
To save a paltry life, | and slay bright fame !
Before young Talbot from old Talbot fly,
The coward horse | that bears me fall and die !
Here on my knee | I beg mortality
Rather than life | preserved with infamy . . .

—though here too there is unavoidably *some* trochaic and other variation, and occasional bridging or shifting of cæsura. In sum, when Greene is monotonously iambic he still lacks the energy of those lines; at his best, still lacking the energy, he produces a more sensitive verse. Now, of such monotonously stressed couplet verse as that just sampled, there is much in RICHARD II, though the couplet-work is not all of the same stamp :—

My liege, one word. | He does me double wrong
That wounds me with the flatteries of his tongue.
Discharge my followers; | Let them hence away,
From Richard's night | to Bolingbroke's fair day.
III, ii, end.

King. Norfolk, throw down, | be bid; there is no boot.
Mow : Myself I throw, | dread sovereign, at thy foot.
My life thou shalt command, | but not my shame :
The one my duty owes| ; but my fair name,
Despite of death | that lives upon my grave,
To dark dishonour's use | thou shalt not have.
I am disgraced, | impeach'd and banish'd here;
Pierced to the soul | with slander's venom'd spear,
The which no balm can cure | but his heart-blood
Which breathed this poison.
King. Rage must be withstood :
Give me his gage : | lions make leopards tame.
Mow. Yea, but not change his spots : | take but my shame,
And I resign my gage. | My dear, dear lord,
The purest treasure mortal times afford
Is spotless reputation : that away,
Men are but gilded loam | or painted clay . . . .
Then dear my liege, | mine honour let me try;
In that I live, | and for that will I die. . . .
I, i.

This verse is not *so* rigid as that of the Talbot scenes; but it is of that general stamp in point at once of regular pausation, clause form, curt sententiousness, and rhetorical key. Compare now some of the couplet-work in Peele's EDWARD I:—

> *Q. Elinor.* Faith, Joan, I think | thou must be
> Gloucester's bride—
> Good earl, how near | he steps unto her side . . . .
> I tell thee, girl, | when I was fair and young
> I found such honey in sweet Edward's tongue,
> As I would never spend | one idle walk
> But Ned and I | would piece it out with talk.—
> So you, my lord, | when you have got your Joan,
> No matter, let queen-mother be alone.
> Old Nell is mother now | and grandmother may,
> The greenest grass | doth droop and turn to hay.
> Woo on, kind clerk, | good Gloucester, love thy Joan:
> Her heart is thine, | her eye is not her own.
>
> Sc. 5.

> *King.* Now say, sweet queen, | what doth my lady crave?
> Tell me, what name | shall this young Welshman have,
> Born Prince of Wales | by Cambria's full consent?
> *Queen.* Edward the name | that doth me well content.
> *King.* Then Edward of Carnarvon shall he be,
> And Prince of Wales, | christened in royalty.
> *Lancaster.* My lord, I think | the King | would take
> a nap.
> *Joan.* Nurse, take the child | and hold it in your lap.
> *King.* Farewell, good Joan; | be careful of my queen.
> Sleep, Nell, the fairest swan | mine eyes have seen.
>
> Sc. 9.

Substance and diction apart, the manner and movement here are close enough to those of many of the RICHARD II lines to suggest the same hand; and if we select from the poorer matter in our play we shall find some that is quite within the measure of Peele. For instance:—

> *K. Rich.* Think what you will: | we seize into our hands
> His plate, his goods, | his money and his lands.
> *York.* I'll not be by the while: | my liege, farewell:
> What will ensue hereof, | there's none can tell;
> But by bad courses may be understood
> That their events | can never fall out good.
>
> II, i, 210-215.

Like Peele, too—though also like Marlowe—is the fashion of passing from blank to rhyme in one speech :—

> *Bushy.* . . . . . So your sweet majesty,
> Looking awry upon your lord's departure,
> Finds shapes of grief more than himself to wail,
> Which, look'd on as it is, is more than shadows
> Of what it is not. Then, thrice gracious queen
> More than your lord's departure weep not : more's not seen ;
> Or if it be, 'tis with false sorrow's eye
> Which for things true weeps things imaginary ;

and here again, though Shakespeare may have touched the blank verse, the rhymed seems within Peele's compass, though it is above his ordinary level in point of concision.

When, further, we note here and elsewhere in the play Peelean tics of phrase, the hypothesis of his part-authorship strengthens somewhat.

(1) "Thrice gracious" is one of these tics; but that is also Marlovian, and there are some that are more significant. For instance (I, iii, 10):

(2) To swear him in the justice of his cause

echoes a number of Peele's :

> And if you will but justice in the cause
> ARR. OF PARIS, IV (Dyce, p. 366*b*).
>
> According to the conscience in the cause
> EDWARD I, sc. 3.

To which I would add, as certainly a line of Peele's :

> Defend the justice of my cause with arms.
> TITUS ANDRONICUS, I, i, 2.

But Marlowe, too, has :—

> But justice of the quarrel and the cause
> EDWARD II, III, iii, 37.
>
> It is our country's cause *Id.* II, v, 52.
>
> My country's cause *Id.* IV, i, 3.

The speech (I, iii, 7) in which the first-cited line occurs in RICHARD is in Peele's manner; and the same might be said of the rhyming lines later in the scene, beginning :

> O ! let no noble eye profane a tear
> For me if I be gor'd with Mowbray's spear.

The introduction among the couplets of the unrhymed line :

Of you, my noble cousin, Lord Aumerle,

is again in Peele's way.

But so far we have seen ground rather for inferring Peele's presence in our play than for his authorship of the rhymed matter. His verse in general has much less force of phrase, less sententious weight : he follows the tune, so to speak, but fits to it a feebler diction, a slacker tissue of speech. Mr. Acheson indeed declares[1] that it was Peele who in 1592 introduced the Talbot passages into 1 Henry VI.[2] If Mr. Acheson is right, he has earned the credit of being the first to give the true solution. But having nowhere seen in Peele so much sustained energy of rhymed diction as pervades the Talbot scenes, with all their bombast, I have always had invincible doubts on that side, and had accordingly made a long and wide search for a stronger claimant. A cluster of tics of phrase —the allusions to Icarus, the items "well I wot," "mickle," and "an if"—suggest Greene; but, as already remarked, most of the matter is not in his manner, and Marlowe and Peele too have some—Marlowe all—of these items. Scanning vocabulary, we note "lither," found in none of the signed work of the pre-Shakespearean play-makers, and as likely to have been Peele's as anybody's, he being much given to the archaic and the vernacular.[3] A more practicable clue, however, is the use of the word "rage," which occurs in the Talbot scenes six times, though it is never elsewhere used in the play, and occurs six times in each of the other plays of the

[1] Shakespeare's Lost Years in London, p. 79.

[2] Mr. Acheson is equally confident in assigning the Roses scene to Shakespeare. Here he has Swinburne and others with him. But Swinburne also assigns the Talbot scenes to Shakespeare; and all these verdicts alike are put without argument or evidence. Yet the Roses scene reaches 28 per cent. of double-endings, and Mr. Acheson dates it 1594; though years after that date we find Shakespeare still far below that percentage. Mr. Acheson fails to see Marlowe's hand in the opening lines of 1 Henry VI, which he assigns to an "unknown original author." Yet nothing more markedly Marlovian exists in the doubtful plays.

[3] Mr. Hart, in the "Arden" edition of the play, following Craig, notes four uses of *lither* in Golding's Ovid—a detail which we may find to give a clue.

trilogy. It is found also ten times in KING JOHN, and eight times in RICHARD II; but the Talbot scenes, where its rate of use is so much higher, are visibly non-Shakespearean[1] (*pace* the shades of Swinburne and Fleay!) and we must look for another hand, both there and in RICHARD. Once more, these crowding faults of turgidity, of bombast falling into bathos, are not the young Shakespeare's faults, any more than is the rigid versification in his manner. By all the methods of detection known to us—metrics, manner, ideation, sentiment, tics of phrase and vocabulary—checking each test by the others, we must seek to track the real author.

Now, "rage" is used by Peele only some half-a-dozen times in his collected works; and never, I think, twice in an Act. One would more readily suspect his hand in the "mad ire and wrathful fury" of scene iii of the same Act of 1 HENRY VI, in one of a set of rhymed lines inserted in his manner among many blank. "Distressèd," occurring in these couplets, is a tic-word which he shares with Marlowe; and "drenched" (=soused or drowned) also points to both; and though "mortality"=death, twice used, does not seem to be a term of Peele's, and does not occur in RICHARD, the line,

> To tutor thee in stratagems of war,

points to

> Train'd up in feats and stratagems of war,

in DAVID AND BETHSABE, sc. ii.

Still we are left groping. Inasmuch as the solution I finally offer is likely to be found surprising and dubious, I shall set forth fully all that I can see in the nature of an alternative hypothesis. In the verse of Munday and Chettle there are not only many rhymed couplets in the manner of the Talbot scenes, but some verbal and phrase items which suggest the possible presence of one of them in 1 HENRY VI. "Rage," for instance, occurs fourteen times in the DEATH OF HUNTINGTON, four times in the DOWNFALL, and six times in Chettle's HOFFMAN. It is

[1] The point might be pressed on almost every line separately; but it seems vain to argue with those who think that Shakespeare could write so. The matter will however be discussed later, over the verdict of Mr. H. C. Hart.

well, accordingly, to take into account a possibility on that side before choosing any other hypothesis. The two HUNTINGTON plays (printed, 1601) were staged in 1597-8, and HOFFMAN is known only in a late posthumous edition, but both men were probably writing before 1592. I take samples from all three of the plays in question :—

Queen. Thou wrong'st me, Robert Earl of Huntington,
And were it not | in pity of this maid
I would revenge | the words that thou hast saied.
Marian. Add not, fair Queen, | distress unto distress :
But if you can, | for pity make his less.
Queen. I can and will forget deserving hate,
And give him comfort in this woful state . . . .
Go, gentle Marian, I will follow thee,
And from betrayers' hands will set thee free.

DOWNFALL OF HUNTINGTON.

They cannot hurt thee, prithee do not fear.
Base curs will couch, | the lion being near.

I am as merry at Matilda's mirth
As I was glad | to see her first day's birth.

You did even what you list, | and so do still :
I am the King, | but you must have your will.

O let not such a thought | abuse thy age ;
We'll never yield us to the tyrant's rage.

DEATH OF HUNTINGTON.

I kiss thy cheek, | and give thee in that kiss
The moiety of all my earthly bliss.

Good, I am half a monarch, half a fiend :
Blood I began in, and in blood must end.

Our tilt and tournament | is spoiled and crossed :
The fair we should defend, | her faith hath lost.

I will do what I can : | oh, hell of life !
Who but a fool | would strive to win a wife.

Father, this latest boon of you I crave
Let him and me | lie in one bed, one grave.

HOFFMAN.

The amount of mere variety in these samples is about as great as in those from 1 HENRY VI and RICHARD II : the general iambic monotony is much the same; and the quality of the diction, though often very flat and always more diffuse, is not always notably inferior. That they are all from one hand is just an apparent possibility; but the hand is in no case

Shakespeare's; and if Chettle be held to have contributed to 1 HENRY VI, where the presumption is strongest, he may conceivably have had a hand in RICHARD II. Supposing, for instance, that he was called in to alter the opening scene of RICHARD II in conformity with Daniel's changes, he might have contributed the flat closing speech, with its rhyme of *labour* and *favour*, which is no worse than that of *mother* and *lover* in HOFFMAN. And there are rather better clues which might be said to point in his direction. To begin with, the crudely fanciful lines of Talbot (IV, vii, 25):

> Brave death by speaking, whether he will or no;
> Imagine him a Frenchman and thy foe;
> Poor boy! he smiles, methinks, as who should say,
> Had Death been French, then Death had died to-day,

suggest kinship with the equally vapid conceit in HOFFMAN:—

> And foolish death would fain, if he could, weep
> For killing her he had no power to keep.

Compare, next, Talbot's repeated image in the lines addressed to his son (IV, v, 45-55):—

> Come, side by side together live and die,
> And soul with soul from France to Heaven fly;

and those over his son's dead body (IV, vii, 20-22):—

> Coupled in bonds of perpetuity,
> Two Talbots, wingèd through the lither sky,
> In thy [Death's] despite shall 'scape mortality,

with Hoffman's address to his father's dead body (sc. i):

> Then hand in hand
> We'll wafte[1] to Paradise;

and with these later echoes of the same idea in the same play:—

> Mount, soul, to heaven, my body burns in fire.
> Act I.
> Hover a little longer, blessed soul,
> Glide not away too fast, mine now forsakes
> His earthly mansion, and on hope's gilt wings
> Will gladly mount with thine . . . Act III.

And the worst strokes in the Talbot scenes are in

[1] Lennard's defensible emendation of "walke." The text is extremely corrupt.

general certainly matchable in the plays in which Chettle is known to have taken part.

> Triumphant death, smeared with captivity,

pairs with his

> Thunder out wrong, compassed with cloudy tears;

while the rhyme-making in the couplet:

> And like a hungry lion did commence
> Rough deeds of rage and stern impatience

—lines which are not sanely to be assigned to Shakespeare, and which seem no more Peelean than Shakespearean—recall these in HOFFMAN:—

> But wretches sentenced never find defence,
> However faultless be their innocence.
>
> Somewhat important wings his aged feet
> With speedy nimbleness.[1]
>
> She now being dead, she'll dwell no more on earth.

Finally, we have to note the record that Chettle, as "your old compositor," was on friendly terms with Nashe,[2] who so highly commended the Talbot scenes in his PIERCE PENILESSE (1592),[3] and might conceivably be acclaiming a colleague.

But all this is indecisive. Chettle makes no claim to the eulogy passed by Nashe. Further, Chettle and Peele are alike obviously imitators of Marlowe in rhetoric; and what we might reckon to be imitation by either of them in the chonicle plays before us may on the other hand have been part of the model-matter which they imitated. The Talbot lines on the two souls flying to heaven, chime with Baldock's address to Spencer in EDWARD II (IV, vi, near end); and thus again point to Marlowe, whose overuse of "rage" was as likely as his figures to be echoed by Chettle. And when we note that the kind of cæsural couplet we have been considering is still of the type already noted as being laid down (after the lead of the SPANISH TRAGEDY) in the old TROUBLESOME RAIGNE, we

[1] This sort of thing occurs also in Heywood. See THE CANON OF SHAKESPEARE, first part, p. 185.

[2] See the letter to Nashe printed by him in HAVE WITH YOU TO SAFFRON WALDEN: Works, ed. McKerrow, iii, 131.

[3] Works, ed. McKerrow, i, 212.

are entitled to revert to that as our primary clue. Thus it goes :—

Rob. Robert, revive thy heart; let sorrow die :
Mother. His falt'ring tongue not suffers him to lie.
What headstrong fury doth enchant my son?
Philip cannot repent, for he hath done. . . . .
Phil. Then, Robin Faulconbridge, I wish thee joy :
My sire a king, and I a landless boy.
God's lady, mother, the world is in my debt :
There's something owing to Plantagenet.
Ay marry, sir, let me alone for game :
I'll act some wonders now I know my name.
By blessed Mary, I'll not sell that pride
For England's wealth, and all the world beside.
Sit fast the proudest of my father's foes :
Away, good mother, there the comfort goes.

So was Marlowe or another spinning couplets in a blank-verse scene as early, probably, as 1588. To Marlowe it is assignable in respect of the line-swing and the vigour of the diction—the points at which he differentiates from Peele alike in rhyme and in blank; and to Marlowe, by these tests, is assignable the blank-verse in which these lines are imbedded. By the same tests, the Talbot scenes are not satisfactorily assignable to Peele, whose couplets never approximate to these in energy. We have to consider, then, the now obvious alternative. The Marlovian character of so much of the blank verse in RICHARD II forces the question whether, as in RICHARD III, what has been taken for imitation of Marlowe by Shakespeare may not be primarily Marlowe's own work, little modified. If we take the opening scene, with its quasi-Peelean first line, there is strong ground for assigning the stronger work to Marlowe. It is seldom at his highest level, and is frequently far below it; but Bolingbroke's speech beginning at line 69 :

Pale trembling coward ! there I throw my gage,

and his next, beginning :

Look, what I speak, my life shall prove it true,

with its cluster of four double-endings, are above Peele's pitch in fluent energy, and distinctly in Marlowe's later manner, though probably revised by the young Shakespeare. There is no sign of Shakespeare's later style,

the style of the period when he reached and exceeded 20 per cent. of double-endings; and these therefore are on that score tentatively to be assigned to Marlowe, who first reached such percentages in signed work. There are, indeed, reasons for inferring[1] that both Peele and Greene in their later work followed the lead of Marlowe, as did Kyd, in double-endings as in other matters; but Marlowe's hand appears so clearly in other scenes of our play that the probability of its presence here is high. And if he is recognisably present in the blank-verse, on what save à priori grounds are we to pronounce that he did none of the rhyme?

That the à priori grounds commonly given are unsound, we have already seen; and there are countervailing considerations. The earliest assignment of literary work to Marlowe is the citation by Warton from Coxeter's MSS. of the memorandum that Marlowe "translated Coluthus's RAPE OF HELEN into English rhyme in the year 1587," and this is not unlikely, though the book is not known to exist. That a poet who began with rhyme should never return to it in drama while all his rivals did is rather improbable than otherwise. The matter is to be critically pronounced upon only after a due examination of the data.

VI. MARLOWE'S RHYMED WORK

There is clearly room, then, for a so-far untried hypothesis as to the Talbot scenes; and inasmuch as neither of those examined is convincing, it is fitting to consider one which, till tested, might seem the unlikeliest of all. Marlowe, I have more than once urged, is the author of the Roses Scene in 1 HENRY VI, with its high percentage (28) of double-endings in end-stopped verse such as Shakespeare *never* writes in the period in which he has certainly reached that percentage. The manner of it is

[1] See above, p. 25.

in every respect entirely Marlovian. Is it not then possible that Marlowe, the most variously exploratory dramatist of his day, did the Talbot scenes also, resorting experimentally to dramatic rhyme in the later years of his short life?[1] Readily admitting the probable unpopularity of such a surmise, I would submit some strong reasons for giving it consideration.

In the first place, repeated scrutiny of EDWARD III, a play in which he predominates, goes far to convince me that Marlowe has done *some* of the rhymed work there, though the Countess episode in the second Act, which he appears to have planned or sketched, has demonstrably been largely recast or expanded by Greene, who is traceable by a multitude of phrases, by verse manner, by ideas, and by vocabulary. And some of the rhymed matter at the end of the first Act, where Greene has apparently not supervened, is at least as good as anything in RICHARD II.

Secondly, the couplet verse in which Marlowe has written his translation of Ovid's Elegies is markedly of the semi-rigid cast of that of the Talbot scenes and the similar verse in RICHARD. A great advance in flexibility is made by him in HERO AND LEANDER; but it has only begun in the Ovid translation, which in large part has exactly the normal cæsural movement and clause-formation of that we have been considering, though it supples as it proceeds. It sets out stiffly, despite a free opening line:—

> We which were Ovid's five books, now are three
> For these before the rest | preferreth he:
> If reading five | thou plain'st of tediousness,
> Two ta'en away, | the labour will be less;
> With Muse prepared, | I mean to sing of arms,
> Choosing a subject fit for fierce alarms:
> Both verses were alike | till Love (men say)
> Began to smile | and took one foot away.
> Rash boy, | who gave thee power | to change a line?
> We are the muses' prophets, none of thine—

and only gradually does the movement grow freer. Sir

[1] I suggested this possibility in SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN, p. 244; but have only recently satisfied myself that the hypothesis is verifiable.

Henry Newbolt, competently noting[1] how the rigid norm of verse gives way in good hands to the free rhythm of natural speech, pronounces that Shakespeare "wrote verse at first stiffly," and only by degrees attained freedom. But this can be said only on the assumption that the conventional canon is sound. Shakespeare in VENUS AND ADONIS, declared by him to be his first "invention," and penned as an exercise in a form which he soon dropped, does *not* write verse stiffly: the very first four lines are *all* variations from the iambic norm:

> Ēven ăs thĕ sūn with purple-colour'd face
> Had tā'en his lāst lēave ŏf thĕ weeping morn,
> Rōse-chēēk'd Adonis hied him tŏ the chase
> Hūntĭng hĕ lōv'd, but love he laugh'd to scorn.

And however generally he may suggest the rhetorical key and tone of Marlowe in KING JOHN, where first we can be sure of having his early blank-verse before us in mass, the general *versification* there has not the primary formalism of the average Marlovian line, any more than the chronic laxity of style of the chronicle plays. It is "stiff" relatively alone to his own later work, and this in respect of being still predominantly line-ended; yet already the proportion of run-on lines is much beyond the Marlovian. Thus wherever we turn to what we can be *sure* is the early work of Shakespeare we find, naturally and inevitably, immaturity, but *his* immaturity and not another's: warrant for noting him as learning his business like another, but no warrant for supposing him to tread blindly and helplessly in others' tracks—no warrant, in a word, for supposing him to have originated RICHARD II any more than RICHARD III.

Thirdly, when we check the vocabulary of RICHARD II in respect of the words which occur there *only* in the Folio, we find no fewer than seven of them in Marlowe's translation of Ovid, besides a number of analogies of word-formation. And as no such large cluster of these words is found in any other of Marlowe's works, this strongly suggests that he was working on the Ovid trans-

[1] App. II to ed. of RICHARD II.

lation about the time of the penning of RICHARD II.[1] That is very likely to have been about the end of 1592, the year of the addition of the Talbot scenes to 1 HENRY VI. Let us then put tentatively the hypothesis that Marlowe, while at work on his translation in couplets, was led as it were to take up Greene's old challenge in the matter of rhyme in drama, and, starting with the Talbot scenes, to carry on the experiment to some extent in RICHARD II, where the subject so lent itself to elegiac treatment.

The hypothesis cannot be barred à priori in Swinburne's fashion. As aforesaid, "the jigging veins of rhyming mother wits," which Marlowe flouted, meant something like the old "fourteener" verse actually named "jigging;" and though the main practice of Marlowe's assigned plays gave the lead to the inference[2] that he disliked much resort to rhyme in drama, the actual resort to couplets in the very play[3] preluded by the assault on "jigging" proves sufficiently that he had no such fixed feeling. By reason of the preconception, however, the hypothesis of his authorship of the Talbot scenes was the last to suggest itself to me as sound. Though the mere diction and the couplet style pointed to him, the clear perception of his presence began for me, I think, in noting that the line:

Triumphant death, *smeared* with *captivity*,

collates with one in RICHARD DUKE OF YORK (v, v):—

Lo, now my *glory*, *smeared* in dust and blood,

in a plainly Marlovian passage; and that "smeared" is a Marlowe word used in 1 TAMB., v, ii—

Smearèd with *blots* of basest *drudgery*,

with the same metaphorical effect as in the two other lines cited. The message of such a clue becomes more insistent when we note that the before-cited line,

To tutor thee in stratagems of war,

[1] See note at the end of this section.

[2] This I originally accepted, and may have applied.

[3] There are four in the opening scene. One seems spurious, as containing a "for to" which hints of Kyd; but the others are quite Marlovian. And in the JEW we have a run of five couplets.

echoed in Peele's DAVID AND BETHSABE, points clearly back to a primary form :

List to me
That *mean to teach you rudiments* of war,

in the Second Part of TAMBURLAINE (III, ii) where Tamburlaine speaks to *his* sons. Either we are on the track of Marlowe, or some one is very resolutely copying him. Peele so copied him in DAVID; but the "tutor" line, on comparison, tells of the original mint.

And when we scan the stronger aspects of the Talbot scenes, their effective lines and the pervading energy which tides over the hasty bombast, I do not see how, save on the old assumption that he *would not* do such couplet work in drama, they can be denied to be probably his. Even if we waive the strong presumption that he wrote the couplets in the first Act of the old RAIGNE OF KING JOHN, there is no real bar to the hypothesis that he took to couplets in making additions to 1 HENRY VI. When all is said, there is nothing staggering in the idea that Marlowe, long before challenged by Greene on the point of setting "the end of scholarism in an English blank verse,"[1] decided, when he was actually translating Ovid in couplets, to meet the challenge by showing the rhymers how he could use their instrument in drama. By Nashe's account, the Talbot scenes had a pronounced success.

The very praise of Nashe may perhaps be held to make it unlikely that the scenes were Marlowe's. Nashe would be likely to know who had written them; and he had, I think, certainly disparaged Marlowe in his epistle prefatory to Greene's MENAPHON in 1589, though after Marlowe's death he denied having ever attacked him. One would fain think only well of such a gifted prosist, but one must regretfully pronounce that he was not speaking the truth.[2] He was a hasty critic. As late as 1592 he charged Harvey with a blunder in using "egregious" in a favourable sense, "whereas *egregious*

[1] Address pref. to PERIMEDES THE BLACKSMITH, 1588.

[2] Despite the benevolent plea of Mr. McKerrow in his masterly edition of Nashe, iv, 445.

is never used in English but in the extreme ill part."[1] It is actually used in the Latin and Italian way by Marlowe (2 TAMB., I, i, 1). But Nashe's very denial, after Marlowe's death, of his former hostility, is reasonably to be explained on the view that he had recanted his first disparagement and had come to see Marlowe's superiority alike to Greene and Peele. It is what he might have been expected to do.

When then we note how Marlovian is the diction in the Talbot scenes, and how closely parallel in movement are the couplets to those of the Ovid translation, the absolute Marlowisms of phrase give us ground for assigning the episode to him such as cannot be made out for any of his contemporaries. No such case can be made out for Peele.

NOTE ON MARLOWE'S TRANSLATIONS

I have suggested that Marlowe was probably working upon his version of Ovid's Elegies about the time of his penning of RICHARD II, seeing that so many words found only in that play in the Folio occur also in that translation. Against this it may be objected that Mr. Tucker-Brooke (following Dyce), in his valuable old-spelling edition of Marlowe pronounces the translation to be "almost certainly the work of Marlowe's Cambridge period, and very probably the earliest of his extant writings." The grounds offered are the frequent blunders, stiffness of expression, and "metrical inexperience." But Mr. Tucker-Brooke, again following Dyce,[2] holds that the version of Lucan, though more mature than that of the Elegies, "has the same general faults, and must, like the other translation, be ascribed to an early period of the poet's career." Now, the version

[1] Works, i, 316.

[2] Who strangely opines that in the Lucan "the versification wants that *variety* of pause which Marlowe latterly was accustomed to observe." Let any student look for himself, and say whether it has not *greater* variety of pause than the general run of Marlowe's blank-verse, despite the bondage of the line-for-line limit.

of Lucan has 26 double-endings in the first 100 lines, and 24 in the last; and there is nothing nearly as high as these percentages in blank-verse either in TAMBURLAINE or in any other play written before 1590. There is, then, an enormously strong presumption against Marlowe's having reached them before that date. I submit, as against Dyce's and Mr. Tucker-Brooke's view, that the verse in the Lucan is structurally the *most* mature penned by Marlowe; and that the couplet-work in the Elegies is not a whit more stiff than that of the Talbot scenes in 1 HENRY VI, by whomsoever written. The faulty scholarship (though apt to be exaggerated by those who do not realise how rarely scholarship is impeccable) is past question; but if Marlowe had ripened on that side after doing a version at college he would surely have revised it.

VII. SPECIFIC CLUES TO MARLOWE

Scanning the Talbot scenes anew in the light of the Marlowe hypothesis, we find it supported by items of vocabulary:

(1) "Over-daring," which occurs only here (IV, iv, 5) in the Folio, is a Marlowe word (EDWARD II, l. 342,[1] 2 TAMB., III, v).

(2) The odd form:[2] "bespoke him thus" (found only in the ERRORS in the Folio, apart from the Talbot scenes) is frequent in Marlowe:—

"And thus bespake him." (HERO AND LEANDER, I, 343.)
"Mildly thus bespake." (EDWARD II, III, ii, 108).
"Bespeak these nobles fair." (*Id.*, I, iv, 336.)
[Marlowe has "speak them fair" also.]
"And, staring, thus bespoke." (Trans. of Lucan, l. 162.)

(3) The archaic "wood"=mad (IV, vii, 35) also occurs in Marlowe (DIDO, IV, iv).

(4) "Ireful," which occurs only here (IV, vi, 16) and

[1] I, iv, 47. Verity, following Bullen and Ellis, without remark prints "over-bearing," but the true text is given by Dyce, Cunningham, Tucker-Brooke, and Briggs.

[2] This is also found in Chapman, who seems to have taken it from Marlowe.

in 3 HENRY VI in the Folio, is also a Marlowe word (JEW OF MALTA, I, ii, 213; FAUSTUS, 1604 4to, near end). We have also "full of ire" in DIDO, l. 508 (II, i).

(5) "Sapless," which occurs only here (II, v, 12; IV, v, 4) is again a Marlowe word (EDWARD III, III, iii, 217).

(6) "Lither," not found elsewhere, I think, in the early Elizabethan drama, is likely to have been suggested to Marlowe by its frequent use in Golding's Ovid, which he would naturally consult when engaged on his rendering of Ovid's Elegies. There are many signs of Golding in Marlowe.

(7) "O'ermatch'd" occurs in the Folio only here and in 3 HENRY VI (I, iv, 64: "over-matching" there also: I, iv, 21). We have "over-matching" in 1 TAMB., II, i, 39; and the noun "overmatch" in 2 TAMB., III, v. As the "overmatched" in 3 HENRY VI occurs in the primary DUKE OF YORK, in a markedly Marlovian passage, it is fitly to be assigned to Marlowe.

(8) "Noble-minded" is found only here (IV, iv, 37) and in TITUS (I, 209) in the Concordance. Mr. Hart ('Arden' ed.) cites examples from Peele and from LOCRINE, in which Peele certainly shared. It may be a Peele word here. But Marlowe has "high-minded" (EDWARD II, I, i, 150).

(9) "Unavoided," = unavoidable (IV, v, 8), points to the same use in RICHARD III, IV, i, 56, and IV, iv, 217, and RICHARD II, II, i, 268. It never occurs in any "Shakespearean" play outside the "Marlowe influence." Mr. Hart notes two uses in Golding's Ovid; and here again we may fairly infer Marlowe's hand, as in "lither."

(10) "Clustering" ("clustering battle of the French": IV, vii, 13) is only here, in all the plays, used thus metaphorically. (Twice, in the TEMPEST, it is used literally.) The word is applied in the same way in EDWARD III (III, iv, 10—"the clustering throng") to a battle.

(11) "Well I wot" (IV, vi, 32) is one of the tags that, as aforesaid, suggest Greene. But, as Mr. Hart notes, it is common; and his remark that Peele would "know it" from Grafton is somewhat inept. "Mickle" and "Icarus," which also suggest Greene, also occur in

Marlowe, and "well I wot" is actually used by the latter in his version of Ovid (II, x, 1) as well as in RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, II, ii. And the duplication of "mickle age" in 2 HENRY VI, v, i, 174, is as unlikely to be Shakespeare's as it is likely to be Marlowe's.

(12) "Rage" is used by Marlowe nine times in the 694 lines of the Lucan translation; where he has also *enraged* (twice), *rageth*, and *raging*.

If we now consider collectively the actual clues of vocabulary to Marlowe in RICHARD II, both in blank-verse and rhyme, not only the hypothesis of his pervading presence in the former, but that of his main share in the latter will be found notably corroborated. Among the words which appear *only* in RICHARD II in the whole Folio are:—

Abstains
All-hating
Bray (sub.)
Broad-spreading
Care-tuned
Chivalrous
Craftsmen
Daintiness
Dangling
Daring-hardy
Discomfortable
Disorderly
Farm (vb.)
Foolishness
Frequent (vb. intr.)
Grassy
Graved (buried)
Inhabitable (=uninhabitable)
Lean-looked
Lean-witted
Misgoverned
Moat
Never-quenching
Oyster-wench
Plume-plucked
Portcullised
Regreet (vb. thrice), I, iii, 67, 142, 186
Restful
Stringless (also 'unstringed')
Taxes (sub.)
Tender-hearted
Undeck
Vauntingly
Whencesoever
Wrath-kindled
Wistly

—besides thirteen formations beginning in *un*. These nonce formations are common in all the writers of the period, and as all seem to have framed them for themselves at need, they are of small significance as clues. But it may be noted that of the once-used "un-" words in Richard, several are found in Marlowe. The other words in the foregoing list are traceable to him as follows:

Abstains (II, i, 76). HERO AND LEANDER, ii, 108. (The poor pun in the play line was quite possible to Marlowe.)

All-hating (v, v, 66). Marlowe has "all-fearful," 1 TAMB.,

III, ii; "all-wasting," trans. of Ovid's Elegies, II, vi, 8; "all-abroad," *Id.*, II, vi, 1.10 from end.

Bray (I, iii, 135). Verb used in EDWARD III, I, ii, 14. The passage in which the verb occurs in HAMLET (I, iv, 11) is substantially the same in both Quartos, and no inference can there be drawn.

Care-tuned (III, ii, 92).[1] Marlowe has "care-got" (Ovid, II, xii, 16). Cp. "Care-crazed," RICHARD III, III, vii, 184.

Craftsmen (I, iv, 28). Occurs in the Ovid trans., III, ii, 52.

Daintiness (V, v, 45). "Dainty" is a frequent word in Marlowe. "Daintily" in 1 TAMB., IV, iv.

Dangling (III, iv, 29) occurs at least twice in Marlowe: HERO AND LEANDER, I, 55; trans. of Ovid, I, xiv, 4.

Daring-hardy (I, iii, 43). Marlowe has "foolish-hardy." And see above, p. 95, as to "over-daring."

Discomfortable (III, ii, 36). Marlowe has "uncomfortable" with the same force in EDWARD III, IV, v, 18; and "discomforted" in EDWARD II, l. 1726.

Farm (vb. I, iv, 45). Used in Ovid trans., I, x, 30.

Grassy (III, iii, 50). Used in Ovid trans., II, xvi, 10.

Inhabitable (I, i, 65). So used in the TAMING OF A SHREW (Sh. Lib. vi, 531), as to Marlowe's authorship of which see the next essay.

Misgoverned (V, ii, 5). In EDWARD II., l. 1756.

Moat (II, i, 48). In EDWARD II, V, v, end; and in 1 TAMB., II, iv.

Oyster-wench (I, iv, 31). "Oyster-wife" in FAUSTUS, II, ii.

Plume-pluck'd (IV, i, 108) points to "piece-torn plumes" in Ovid trans., II, vi, 5; "doth mean to pull my plumes" in 1 TAMB., I, i, 33; and "I'll take away those borrow'd plumes of his" in EDWARD III, I, ii, 85. Cp. DIDO, I, i, 34, 40, 41.

Portcullis occurs in JEW OF MALTA, III, iv, near end.

Regreet (vb. thrice in this play). Occurs in 1 TAMB., III, i, 37.

Restful (IV, i, 12). Occurs in ALPHONSUS OF GERMANY, V, 245.

Taxes (noun; II, i, 246). Occurs in JEW OF MALTA, I, ii, 65.

Undeck (= strip: IV, i, 250). "Undecked," with this exact force, occurs in Ovid trans., I, iv, l. 12 from end; and "pompous," in the same line of the play, collates with three uses of "pomp" in Eleg. III, ii; two uses in DIDO, III, iii; and "the pompous sun" in EDWARD III, IV, v, 14—a Marlowe passage. See also "undecked" in that play, I, ii, 150.

Wrath-kindled (I, i, 152). Occurs in Ovid trans., II, v, l. 11 from end—and at the beginning of a line, as in our play.

To these items of vocabulary, which so convincingly reinforce the inference of Marlowe's authorship, we have to add those indicated by the editorial comments before cited on the non-Shakespearean peculiarities of word-use

in our play. It is remarkable that the great majority of those instances, cited with no theory in view, point us to Marlowe. The monosyllabic first foot, the dissyllabic use of "lords," the stichomuthia, the direct "reminiscences" from FAUSTUS and EDWARD II, the special use of "barbarism"=barbarians, the scansion "sepùlchre" (noun)—all directly reinforce the Marlowe hypothesis. And the special uses of "inherit" and of "merit"= "reward" lead to the same conclusion; for Marlowe in the lines (JEW, I, ii, 197-9):—

> For only I have toiled to inherit[1] here
> The months of vanity and loss of time
> And painful nights have been appointed me;

and again in the Ovid translation (III, vi, end):

> But for thy merits I wish thee, white stream,
> Dry winters aye, and suns in heat extreme,

gives these forces—properly so in the latter case, since one of the alternative forces of *meritum* is reward or punishment; and *pro meritis* in the original has the latter meaning.[2] And Dyce independently notes that Marlowe's use of the verb "merit" in his translation of Lucan, l. 340, is wrong unless we read "merit naught" in the sense of "receive no reward." These uses of "merit" and "inherit" are not uncommon in Elizabethan prose and verse;[3] but "reaps the merit of his deeds" in ALPHONSUS OF GERMANY, IV, i, 48, is evidently Marlowe's.

Additional relevant items are :—

(1) Pill'd (vb.=plundered: II, i, 246). This verb occurs elsewhere in the Folio in RICHARD III (I, iii, 159) and TIMON (IV, i, 12). The use in both of the RICHARD plays points to Marlowe's "pilling brigandines" (1 TAMB., III, iii, 148).

(2) Upstart (adj. II, iii, 122: noun in 1 HENRY VI, IV, vii, 87, as noted above) occurs as an adjective in the MASSACRE, I, ii.

(3) Gnarling occurs only here (I, iii, 292) and in 2 HENRY VI, III, i, 192. It is presumably a Marlowe word, though in the FIRST PART OF THE CONTENTION it stands "snarring."

(4) Rankle similarly occurs only here (I, iv, 302) and in RICHARD III (I, iii, 291), and in both passages refers to a tooth.

[1] See also trans. of Ovid, II, xii, 6.

[2] Ovid has "*non* candide torrens"; but, as Dyce notes, Marlowe's copy read *nunc* for *non*.

[3] Daniel has: "She deserved no merit" (TRAGEDY OF CLEOPATRA, II, 34).

(5) Unavoided, noted above in connection with the Talbot scenes, is here to be reckoned as coming from the same hand, not as a weak echo by Shakespeare.

(6) Broad-spreading (III, iv, 50). Occurs also in 1 HENRY VI (I, ii, 135), where it must be assigned to Marlowe. He has "broad spread" in the Lucan trans., l. 439; and "largely spreading" in HERO AND LEANDER, II, 107.

(7) Frequent (vb. : v, iii, 6) occurs elsewhere only in the late-period plays, TIMON and PERICLES. It is used by Marlowe in Ovid trans., II, v, 2; III, viii (vii), 50. ("Unfrequented" in EDWARD II, I, iv.)

(8) "Young wanton and effeminate boy" (v, iii, 10) is a palpable echo of "female wanton boy" in DIDO, I, i, and "this effeminate brat" in 2 TAMB., IV, ii.

In yet another case, a particular scansion may more doubtfully be held to point to Marlowe. Clark and Wright note on II, ii, 142, that "*presages*, as a noun, occurs only in two other metrical passages in Shakespeare, and then with the accent on the first syllable. The instances given are both in KING JOHN (I, i, 28; III, iv, 158):

> And sullen presage of your own decay.
>
> Abortives, presages, and tongues of heaven.

Clerk and Wright have overlooked the uses of the word in the VENUS (l. 457) and in Sonnet 107 :—

> This ill presāge advisedly she marketh.
>
> And the sad augurs mock their own presāge.

Now, Elizabethan poets rather frequently use different scansions of a given word : thus both Marlowe and Heywood give us "théatres" and "theátres"; and we have seen Marlowe using both "sépulchre" and "sepúlchre" as noun. But it is a fair inference that Shakespeare, after using "preságe" in the VENUS, adopted "présages" in JOHN on the leading of Marlowe, and only long afterwards reverted to "preságe" in the Sonnet, which is certainly late. Here he was probably influenced by Chapman, who so scans the word, I think, invariably. The line in RICHARD II is quite un-Shakespearean. Yet in the very passage of the old RAIGNE OF KING JOHN (Pt. I, v, ii : Sh. Lib. vol. v, p. 275) which Shakespeare may be supposed to have had in view in writing Pan-

dulph's speech near the end of Act III of his play, we have the lines:

> *John.* What might portend these apparitions,
> Unusual signs, forerunners of event,
> *Presagers* of strange terror to the world,

where, though it is possible to read "présagers," the scansion "preságe" is suggested by the line:

> Portend this clime, if they presage at all,

which occurs but a little further on. And both appear to be Marlowe's, by the test of style! Scansions were for the poets and players alike of no great importance, though Nashe exclaimed against "hòrizon," used by Marlowe and Kyd. But in this case the best way of accounting for Shakespeare's variation as between the VENUS and JOHN, is Marlowe's variation in RICHARD II.

Further clues of vocabulary and phrase may doubtless be found; but these may suffice. The evidential force of a list of words occurring only in one play in the Folio, and found in the works of another and contemporary playwright, is obviously cumulative. If all the words occurring only in any one play were found in a contemporary playwright, the presumption of his authorship would be so great that only the strongest counter-evidence, external or internal, could countervail it. Such completeness of proof is, however, impossible, seeing that all authors seem to use *some* words in only one work. But when a given Shakespeare play yields a long list of once-used words, and a considerable number of them are to be found in the plays of a contemporary, there is a reasonable presumption that either (*a*) he has written a considerable part of the play as it stands, or (*b*) he drafted it, and the revision has fallen short of complete re-writing.

The next critical step is to scan the styles, the versification, and the phraseology. If the versification of the impeached play is found to be markedly un-Shakespearean, as compared with that of the undisputed plays, and to be markedly like that of the author who yields a large number of the once-used words, the presumption from coincidence of vocabulary is at once and greatly strengthened. And if in addition the way of thinking, the mode of

metaphor, the emotional key, the habit of diction, are found to correspond, even to the extent of a number of duplications of non-proverbial phrase and trope, the presumption becomes so strong that no alternative is left to the inference of the partial or general authorship of the indicated playwright save the conclusion that the impeached play has been written with a deliberate purpose of systematic imitation.

Let us then extend on the phrasal side our survey of the coincidences in the case before us, and realise the extent of the imitation that would have to be imputed. We have noted, in addition to our list of words found only in our play and in Marlowe, certain coincidences of phraseology, such as the reiterated use of the crude figure connecting a lie or its denial with the "throat" of the antagonist, and the reiterated use of the expression "spit at" in invective. Next come such coincidences of phrase as these :—

(1) "Seldom spent in vain," above noted, is also partly used in RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, III, i, near end. That in RICHARD II, then, is a third use.

(2) "It earn'd my heart" (v, v, 76), found in EDWARD II, IV, vi, 70, in the form :

> My heart with pity earns to see this sight,

and elsewhere in the Folio only in the un-Shakespearean passage in JULIUS CÆSAR (II, ii, 129) :

> That every like is not the same, O Cæsar;
> The heart of Brutus earns to think upon

—that is to say, in a play also under challenge as having been originated by Marlowe. In RICHARD II and EDWARD II alike it is applied to the spectacle of a deposed King; and in CÆSAR there is a similar connection.

(3) In EDWARD II (v, i, 11 sq.) we have :

> When the imperial lion's flesh is gored
> He rends and tears it with his wrathful paw . . .

In RICHARD II (v, i, 29-30) we have :

> The lion dying thrusteth forth his paw
> And wounds the earth, if nothing else, with rage
> To be o'erpower'd.

(4) In RICHARD II (IV, i, 281 sq.) we have :

Was this face the face
That every day under his household roof
Did keep ten thousand men? Was this the face, *etc.*

In FAUSTUS (V, iii, near end) we have :—

Was this the face that launched a thousand ships?

(5) In RICHARD II (IV, i, 260-2) the King cries :

O ! that I were a mockery King of snow . . . .
To melt myself away in water-drops.

In FAUSTUS (V, iv, near end) we have :

O soul ! be changed into small water drops !

and in DIDO (IV, iv) :

As many Moors
As in the sea are little water-drops ;

and in Part I of TAMBURLAINE (III, i, 8 sq.) :—

As many circumcised Turks we have . . . .
As hath the ocean or the Terrene sea
Small drops of water . . . .

and in Part II (I, iii) :—

In number more than are the drops that fall
When Boreas rents a thousand swelling clouds.

(6) As before noted, we have in EDWARD II and in EDWARD I a line :—

The worst is temporal thou canst inflict,

in which either Peele imitates Marlowe or Marlowe Peele. In RICHARD II (III, ii, 94) we have the echo :

The worst is worldly loss thou canst unfold.

(7) In RICHARD II (V, v, 83) Bolingbroke rides the horse Barbary

So proudly as if he disdained the ground.

In I TAMBURLAINE (IV, i) the warriors ride

Upon their prancing steeds disdainfully,
With wanton faces, trampling on the ground.

(8) In RICHARD II (III, iv, 7) we have :

My legs can keep no measure with delight.

In DIDO (IV, iv, end) we read :

To move unto the measures of delight.

(9) In RICHARD II (V, v, 21) we have :

The flinty ribs
Of this hard world, my ragged prison walls.

In EDWARD II (III, iii) "ragged stony walls" is a description of a prison.

And so on. Let the supporters of the Imitation Theory, then, realise to what they are committed. On their view, Shakespeare saw fit not only to duplicate many times crude vulgarisms of invective because Marlowe used them, but to repeat turns of phrase, saws, clichés, odds and ends of declamation, bad metaphors and good, old proverbs, and new tags, just because they were Marlowe's. In later days, he could echo the "face that launched a thousand ships" with

> A pearl
> Whose price has launched above a thousand ships
> And turned crowned Kings to merchants

—a graceful imitation, openly designed as such and consciously inferior to the original, but well turned to his own manner. And so, in AS YOU LIKE IT, the "sly,[1] slow hours" of RICHARD II and the "Mellowed by the stealing hours of time" of RICHARD III (III, i, 178) pass into the music of

> Lose and neglect the creeping hours of time,

—his own phrasing and his own rhythm. In RICHARD II we are asked to suppose him fumbling nervously over "Was this face the face," and getting in "ten thousand men," in a duly Marlowesque manner, to no new outcome worth printing. In HAMLET he (or a prior draftsman)[2] could turn the "melt away in water drops" into

> O that this too, too solid flesh would melt,
> Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew.

In RICHARD II, on the Imitation Theory, he could but convulsively imagine the "mockery king of snow" to introduce the actual "water drops" of the original; as he must introduce "virtue of necessity," which, on the Imitation Theory, he was also to exploit in the TWO GENTLEMEN. In RICHARD III he must write "Chop off his head"

[1] This use of "sly," which has caused much debate (Pope proposing "fly-slow") points distinctly to Marlowe, who gives "sly" the force of "unobserved" in the line

> He slyly stole away and left his men

in RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, I, i, 3; and again in HERO AND LEANDER, i, 147.

[2] That Marlowe may have been associated with Kyd in drafting or recasting HAMLET is one of the possibilities to be kept in view.

and "Off with his head," and yet twice again employ the phrase, just because Marlowe had done it so often before. He was, in short, upon that theory, not only a possessed imitator but an impotent one, echoing without inspiration, hypnotised by echoes, maniacally mimicking the model of the moment,—though in a lucid interval he could even then outsing them all, turning their loud rhetoric to a strain of another world. Like a soul bewitched, he must put into RICHARD II (I, iii, 145):

> The sun that warms you here, shall shine on me,

just before or just after putting

> The self-same heaven
> That frowns on me, looks sadly upon him

into RICHARD III (V, iii, 286). And in RICHARD II, as if there were not otherwise imitation enough, he must ineptly echo himself:

> That sets the word itself against the word (V, iii, 122).
>
> And so set the word itself
> Against the word (V, v, 95).
>
> Lo, as at English feasts, so I regreet
> The daintiest last, to make the end most sweet (I, iii, 67).
>
> As the last taste of sweets is sweetest (II, i, 13).

—using the verb "regreet" here and in two other passages in the same scene because it was a Marlowe word, though he was never to use it again.[1]

And, withal, he must imitate the model's gait in verse and in turgidity of diction, the manner equally with the matter, like a schoolboy aping his hero. He must say "sepúlchre" (noun) because Marlowe once said "sepúlchre" (noun). We are invited to believe that but a little while before penning the DREAM he thought fit to write hundreds of verses like:

> Never did captive with a freer heart
> Cast off his chains of bondage and embrace
> His golden uncontroll'd enfranchisement
> *More than* my dancing soul doth celebrate
> This feast of battle with mine adversary

—using the Marlowe swing, with the Marlowe heedless-

[1] In JOHN it is a noun.

ness, the Marlowe one-line rhythm, and the Marlowe blare, just because Marlowe wrote so;[1] hundreds of lines of sonorous commonplace, like :

> Even in condition of the worst degree
> In gross rebellion and detested treason :
> Thou art a banished man, and here art come
> Before the expiration of thy time
> In braving arms against thy sovereign ;

or flat-footed stuff that is not even sonorous :

> My lord of Salisbury, we have stay'd ten days
> And hardly kept our countrymen together,
> And yet we hear no tidings from the King :
> Therefore we will disperse ourselves : farewell—

—all because the over-driven Marlowe, earning his bread at less than a penny a line, so wrote. And so with the puns, the platitudes, and the concetti.

À priori, once more, it may have been that the Unique One, the Master, *sui generis*, was so strangely constituted that he must thus "make himself a motley to the view" a little while before he set Falstaff making irresistibly genial fun alike of Marlovian rant and Euphuistic conceit, and when he was actually about to write the charmed verse of the DREAM. A supreme genius *may* perhaps become so by cataclysm. But that we should be asked to believe in some such psychologic miracle merely because the theatre company ascribed to Shakespeare's pen all the plays which it purchased and which he retouched, is a strain upon our credulity which some of us must decline to bear. The cataclysm is so much less likely than the simple solution that the theatre company

[1] Compare :—

> Sweet lord and King, your speech preventeth mine.
> Yet have I words left to express my joy :
> The shepherd nipt with biting winter's rage
> Frolics not *more* to see the painted spring
> Than I do to behold your majesty.
>
> EDWARD II, II, ii.

> Your presence, loving friends and fellow-Kings,
> Makes me to surfeit in conceiving joy :
> If all the crystal gates of Jove's high court
> Were open'd wide and I might enter in
> To see the state and majesty of heaven,
> It could not *more* delight me than your sight.
>
> 2 TAMB., I, iii.

did acquire plays which Shakespeare copyrighted for them by revision, as he did the HENRY VI trilogy, so visibly mere superficial revisions of older plays, and so notoriously so even in Meres's day that he does not name them as Shakespeare's.

If the devotee of the Imitation Theory should argue, as he conceivably might, that neck-or-nothing imitation and self-imitation by Shakespeare is no more perplexing than wholesale imitation by Marlowe of himself, the answer is instant and simple. Marlowe, Greene and Peele, all echoed themselves *ad nauseam*; and they did it, we may say, perforce, because they were all hack-writers, living from hand to mouth.* Greene's prose works, as above noted, swarm with repetitions of phrases, formulas, figures: writing always against time, he made his copy anyhow. Peele, less fecund and more lazy, is little less repetitious; and Marlowe, so much the most powerful of the three, could not escape the compulsion of self-repetition in a life of rapid play-production under pressure of need.

Nor had he, any more than the others, any disinclination to it. His lyrism is spontaneously repetitive. In HERO AND LEANDER (i, 184) he sings that

> Love deeply grounded, hardly is dissembled;

and again (ii, 131):

> O, none but gods have power their love to hide,

saying it yet again three times over in the context. And so in the plays. In TAMBURLAINE we see him delightedly repeating lines many times over, apparently in sheer joy over their resonance, as in the instances:

> From Amazon to Tunis near the sea
> Is Barbary unpeopled for thy sake . . . .
>
> From strong Tesella unto Biledull
> All Barbary is unpeopled for thy sake.
>
> 2 TAMB., I, iii.
>
> And shall I die, and thus unconquered?
> (Twice in one speech: *id.*, V, iii.)

Equally does he reiterate tropes. At the death of Zenocrate, Tamburlaine declaims (2 TAMB., II, ii, 105):

> For amorous Jove hath snatched my love from hence;

* See below, concluding section, as to Marlowe's output.

in the same play (IV, iii) Theridamas has the lines :

> Supposing amorous Jove had sent his son,
> The winged Hermes, to convey thee hence ;

and yet again, over the dead Olympia, he cries :

> Infernal Dis is courting of my love.

In RICHARD DUKE OF YORK (I, ii) the line :

> Stern Fauconbridge commands the narrow seas

echoes or gives the cue to :

> The haughty Dane commands the narrow seas

in EDWARD II (II, i, 166); but there is no reason to doubt that both are penned by Marlowe, or to deny that the *Et tu Brute* of the former play (V, iv) can be a repetition by Marlowe of that cry as originally put by him in the JULIUS CÆSAR upon which we hold Shakespeare's play to have been based. To repetitions of phrase no less than of idea he showed a bias from the first, as here :

> And now we will to fair Persepolis . . . .
> To follow me to fair Persepolis . . . .
> And ride in triumph through Persepolis (*thrice*).
> 1 TAMB., II, v.
>
> To entertain divine Zenocrate
> 2 TAMB., II, iv—*four times.*

> Like to the cruel brothers of the earth,
> Sprung of the teeth of dragons venomous.
> (1 TAMB., I, ii : reiterated by Mycetes.)

His famous "face that launched a thousand ships" is a recast of :

> Helen, whose beauty summoned Greece to arms
> And drew a thousand ships to Tenedos [1]
> (2 TAMB., II, iv);

and to the "Helen, make me immortal with a kiss" (of FAUSTUS) he returns in DIDO (IV, iv) :

> And he'll make me immortal with a kiss

—unless that be the first form. One can trace him by his

[1] Yet again, the same thought, with a different turn, occurs in EDWARD II (II, v, 15) :—

> That, like the Greekish strumpet, trained to arms
> And bloody wars so many valiant Knights.

tropes almost as surely as by his line. In TAMBURLAINE we have :

> And I would strive to swim through pools of blood . . . .
> Ere I would lose the title of a King.

We know the hand when in EDWARD III (II, ii, 157) we get :

> But I will through a Hellespont of blood
> To arrive at Sestos where my Hero lies.

And when we read in EDWARD II (II, ii, 16) of

> A lofty cedar-tree, fair flourishing,
> On whose top-branches kingly eagles perch,

and in RICHARD DUKE OF YORK (sc. xx, 6-9) of the cedar

> Whose arms gave shelter to the princely eagle,
> Under whose shade the ramping lion slept,
> Whose top-branch overpeered Jove's spreading tree,

we know to whom to assign the latter passage.

Thus ready to re-chant his successes, he was led perforce to repeat sententious sayings, *gnomai*, maxims, tags, tropes, as did his competitors, in order to maintain the average vivacity and declamatory vigour of a series of plays which had no due time for gestation, and could only in parts yield fresh inspiration. An Elizabethan dramatist of the first flight, so situated, had indeed no cause to shrink from repetition. There was as a rule no expectation of print; and if there were, it did not concern the bulk of the theatre audience to note *clichés* or echoes. Audiences that accepted such undisguised duplications of stage-business as the Richard-Anne and Richard-Elizabeth scenes in RICHARD III, and the quarrels of Bolingbroke with Mowbray (I, i) and Bagot with Aumerle (IV, i) in RICHARD II, would make small account of duplications of lines, images or ideas; indeed there is a presumption that they rather liked them, as congregations palated favourite texts. In any case, they got them in every play.

But that Shakespeare should humbly trade on that practice or predilection, so prostrating himself in the pursuit of popularity, at the age when men are most independent, as to ape through whole plays every trick and aspect of one contemporary after another, coining brass

by the barrow-load when he was capable of minting gold —this is "a thing imagination boggles at." His real echoes of others, whether in sonnets, poems, or plays, are either open quotations or simple adaptations of current phrase made in the easy Elizabethan way, with his own voice, his own versification. He too, sooth to say, wrote often enough at speed, having all Marlowe's facility, and no great hampering literary scrupulosity in carrying out a task which for him too was one of bread-winning first and foremost. But he of all men needed not to copy continuously other men's gait, other men's unconsidered verbiage, other men's mechanical brush-work and stereotyped presentments of character. Had he planned a RICHARD III, it would not have been a mere replica of the figure outlined at the end of RICHARD DUKE OF YORK. Had he planned RICHARD II it would not have been a mere variant of EDWARD II, with countless repetitions from the rival's repertory. And we posit, accordingly, as against the Imitation Theory, the common-sense conclusion that—save for revision, too often inadequate, occasional re-writing of passages, and it may be, episodes by other hands—the plain Marlowese of the mass of the verse of RICHARD II, blank and rhymed, is just Marlowe, as are the Marlowisms of phrase.

And when accomplished editors tell us concerning

A dearer merit, not so deep a maim (I, iii, 156),

meaning "A fairer reward, not so deep a wound," that "the criss-cross alliteration is Shakespearean,"[1] we must patiently but firmly reply that it is not; that in so far as Shakespeare deals in such antithetic alliteration he is simply following a common mode; that this particular line has no Shakespearean "merit"; and that to write "merit" for "reward" was in Marlowe's way and not in Shakespeare's. Equally must we demur when other editors[2] tell us, in explanation of slip-shod matter in this play, that "Shakespeare's language often hovers uncertainly between prose and verse." The "metrical redun-

[1] Later Clar. Press ed. *in loc.*

[2] Clark and Wright.

dancies of this play" are the sins not of a young Master at work on his first tragedy, but of a hardened "old hand." And so with all the devout devices of dutiful scholarship to disguise the inferior quality of a play which, had it not been put forward as Shakespeare's in the Folio, would never have been by any man reckoned worthy of him as a whole even in his nonage, though he had visibly touched it in parts. Much mistaken effort has been bestowed on the attempt to prove that he wrote the whole or part of EDWARD III, which is visibly begun and planned by Marlowe, expanded in the Countess scenes by Greene, and shared-in certainly by Kyd, and probably by Peele. The illusion of Shakespeare's presence is set up by the very fact that the hands of Marlowe and Greene, there visible, penned works which we are invited by the Canon to ascribe to Shakespeare.[1] If he wrote these, why not that? Had EDWARD III been in the Canon, its better parts would have been acclaimed as undeniably his, and the worse, probably, accepted by most critics with the rest. But had RICHARD II been anonymous, while there might have been some question of assigning to him the better parts, the play as a whole would have been assigned to him by nobody. Its Marlowe marks could not then have been missed.

As it is, observant editors cannot help seeing and noting them as parallels, but never do they draw the natural inference. The abstinence is particularly striking in the case of two specially significant echoes, with which the present protracted survey may be closed. Dr. W. D. Briggs, in the notes to his admirably learned edition of EDWARD II (p. 185), shortly after arguing somewhat doubtfully that Marlowe was "perhaps unequal" to the portraying of Richard, has to record this startling parallel between the EDWARD II line (2064= 2097 in Tucker-Brooke,[2]=v, i, 111):

Or if I live let me forget myself,

[1] There are, further, the phrasal clues, discussed in the volume "Did Shakespeare write TITUS ANDRONICUS?" 1905, pp. 159, 171.

[2] Who counts the stage directions as lines.

and these in RICHARD II (III, iii, 138-9):—

> Or that I could forget what I have been,
> Or not remember what I must be now;

and that between the next lines in the former play:

> *Bishop.* My lord—
> *Edward.* Call me not lord: away out of my sight!

and these in RICHARD II (IV, i, 253-4):—

> *Northumberland.* My lord—
> *Richard.* No lord of thine, thou haught insulting man!

Such absolute echoing of the earlier play in the later is surely in singular conflict with the claim that the later is intellectually on a higher plane. Such absolute duplication of another man's ideas would prove, if anything, that Shakespeare felt himself unequal to the invention of new ones at this point. And it is the penalty of traditionism that, seeking to aggrandise Shakespeare on the side of quantity, it thus belittles him on the side of quality, reducing him, as the Imitation Theory so fatally and so invariably does, to the status of a fumbling plagiarist. The critical method which relieves him of such and so much discredit may claim a right to attention on that score, as well as on its own.

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Save for Swinburne's surprising pronouncement that the rhymed matter reveals a swerving of allegiance from Marlowe to Greene on the part of the young Shakespeare, the "influence" of Marlowe in RICHARD II may be said to be almost universally recognised in respect not only of the theme but of the style.[1] It is already apparent, as we have noted, in the first scene; and though the neatness of the couplets of ii, 176-185, may well be held to indicate a re-writing by Shakespeare, the primitive turgidity of others is impossible for him at any time. They must be consistently assigned, then, to the couplet-writing

[1] A critic who assented to the Marlowe hypothesis for RICHARD III, but claimed a far higher quality for RICHARD II, will presumably protest here. But the facts are irresistible. Marlowe's *style* varied largely, with his themes, though his dramatic blank *verse* remained substantially the same to the end.

Marlowe, who reveals himself in the Talbot scenes, with their alternate bombast and vigorous diction. The second scene, again, though it might be conceived to be Peele's, is equally non-Shakespearean; and even the apparent clues to Peele in the third do not carry us far. The bulk of the scene strongly suggests the hand of Marlowe, with, however, an aspect of continuous revision by Shakespeare, yielding a level of relative smoothness which Marlowe does not often maintain for any length in chronicle work, though plenty of lax execution remains. And it is again the hand of Marlowe that marks scene iv.

Thus, save for the traits or echoes of Peele before noted, which suggest some early connection with the play on his part, the first Act is essentially and thoroughly Marlovian; and while we have noted the correspondences with Peele in the Gaunt scene-section, which again hint of some intervention by him, we must still assign the clear predominance in the scene as a whole to Marlowe. On a scrutiny of its structure, it suggests a process of revision. After Gaunt has been borne out, and Richard has but exchanged a few angry lines with York, Northumberland enters to say that "old Gaunt commends him to your majesty"; Richard asks: "What says he?" and Northumberland answers, "Nay, nothing; all is said." It is natural to suspect that these lines had been penned before the full insertion of the scene-section in which Gaunt has said all: as they stand they are gratuitous. Yet again, the speech of Richard (ii, 216-224) which precedes his exit is surprising in its appointment of York as viceroy immediately after he has said, on his exit:

> *I'll not be by the while*: my liege, farewell:
> What will ensue hereof, there's none can tell;
> But by bad causes may be understood
> That their events can never fall out good.

The previous speech of York has been visibly revised by Shakespeare: this has not, and as it is so incompatible with the King's pronouncement one is moved to infer an intervention, perhaps more readily assignable to Peele

than to any other. But all that is clear at this point is that there has been some reconstruction of a pre-Shakespearean play, as Mr. John infers from the passage (ii, 168-169) on "the prevention of poor Bolingbroke about his marriage"; and that the foundation matter is predominantly Marlowe's. But it is precisely the difference of touch between the evidently Shakespearean revision and the fundamental diction and versification of Marlowe that negates the notion of a deliberate imitation. Where Shakespeare re-writes, he is not imitating the Marlowe manner, he is introducing his own.

Something, perhaps, remains to be said upon the plea that Shakespeare at a given period wrote "under the influence" of Marlowe, and the corollary that Marlowesque matter in the early plays may accordingly have been wholly of Shakespeare's own penning. When it is shown in detail that in a given case many actual phrases of Marlowe's are used, as in Clarence's Dream, it is urged in reply that these may be deliberate reproductions, seeing that Shakespeare does actually quote Marlowe in As You Like It and in Troilus—as if an avowed quotation were the same thing as a wholesale plagiarism, and as if one open echo of a very famous line were on all fours with a mosaic of echoed phrases. This line of argument, clearly, must resolve itself into that thesis of deliberate imitation of *style* which persistently cumbers the ground. Only a writer bent on the most systematic imitation could deliberately select a set of tic phrases from the model and embody them in his exercise.

Such an exercise, we are invited to believe, Shakespeare composed in Clarence's Dream, as in the bulk of the rest of Richard III; and such an exercise, with an almost equally-marked resort to Marlowese phrases, we are in effect invited to recognise in Richard II. One answers by pointing to the samples of the real Shakespeare in both plays, passages written in his own *cantabile* verse. Why should he write the other style when he has already compassed a finer of his own? Modest he doubtless was: no great writer of his day so far eluded self-exhibition; even the private Sonnets

remain cryptic as regards his inner self, while revealing his modesty of self-appraisement on the literary side. But are we to conceive him as diffident to the point of anxiously parodying for years the styles in turn of all of his early corrivals, not daring to write in his own fashion, save here and there, till they were all out of the way?

Of what genius, in the whole history of literature, is there any such record? The delicate Stevenson, it is true, has told how he played the "sedulous ape" by way of forming a style. But this surely does not mean that his early tales and essays were purposely written in the style of any one model. If so, which? What he meant was that he began to learn his craft by writing exercises with an eye on the styles which pleased him, as thousands of us, probably, have much less fruitfully done in our time. No published essay or tale of Stevenson can be described as a planned imitation of any predecessor in the degree in which the two Richard plays are imitations of Marlowe. PULVIS ET UMBRA, it may be, was suggested by Browne; but it is an exercise in a given vein, not an imitation of one style, and its key and treatment are not at all Browne's. And Shakespeare, a very much greater genius than Stevenson, is just so much the more unlikely to have crept on his early way for years on the clogs of parody in the field in which he was gifted above all other men. The earliest reference we have to his play-making activity in his 'prentice-time is Greene's account of him as one who "supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blank verse as the best of you"—this in 1592. Greene thus pictures "Shake-scene" as conceited and arrogant. We know he was not; but if his blank-verse were a mere perpetual echoing, whether brazen or timid, of his predecessors, Greene's malice might be said to have some fair foundation.

Shall we then suppose that when Greene wrote: "let those Apes imitate your past excellence, and never more acquaint them with your admired inventions," he was putting the case truly; and that only in later years did Shakespeare venture to seek a style of his own? Was

the VENUS, where he does sing in a current mode with his own voice, a first effort, not merely in "invention" but in individual writing, to which he was goaded by Greene's attack? That the supreme genius was thus merely kicked into originality by the insolence of a moribund small one I am quite unable to believe. That he had penned TITUS ANDRONICUS, as the traditionists would have us believe, in abject imitation of the styles, tics, and phrases of Peele, Kyd, Marlowe and Greene, I take to be the theoretic *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole theory of systematic imitation. It makes out Shakespeare the supreme fool in æsthetic history, earnestly playing the fool on his way to be the Supreme Master. Masters are not so made. Shakespeare in 1592 attained the age of 28.[1] Shakespeare was not, indeed, so early mature as Marlowe, because he had so much more to grow to. But he can hardly at that age have been a mere slavish imitator of styles radically alien to his own.[2] He had a critical as well as a poetical faculty: it flashes out again and again in the earlier plays, humorously in the LABOUR and 1 HENRY IV, seriously in the DREAM, and powerfully in HAMLET. And it is finally *because* Shakespeare in a Sonnet (29) speaks of himself as "desiring this man's art

[1] An engaging journalist, Mr. St. John Ervine, resenting the "astounding" suggestion (in the preceding volume) that RICHARD III is a Marlowe play (a suggestion of which he would appear to have heard for the first time in a review of the volume in question), justified his attitude by the proposition that nothing was more natural than that the young Shakespeare should write a play in wholesale imitation, with endless absolute echoes, of his "friend and admired elder" Marlowe. Now, Marlowe was baptised on 26th February, 1564, and Shakespeare on 26th April of the same year. This exiguous basis of difference in age served Mr. Ervine (who presumably had forgotten the dates) for a column of very readable expatiation; but it will probably be conceded—even by Mr. Ervine when he learns the facts—that the argument from mere seniority can hardly stand; and when it is noted that RICHARD III exhibits at points the style of Kyd, and perhaps that of Heywood, as well as that of Marlowe, others may realise that the whole "imitation" theory is chimerical. Mr. Ervine announces: "I have applied whatever intelligence God has given me to creative artistry." The implication would appear to be that no intelligence, God-given or other, is required for the tasks of criticism. There is doubtless something to be said for this, from the point of view either of statistics or of a hardy intuitionism; but I am constrained, as a critic, to pronounce the position unsound. Even Mr. Ervine does some reasoning.

[2] It might be argued on this that Carlyle, writing his LIFE OF SCHILLER at 28, had not yet found his own style. But his early style is not a parody of any other man's; while it might be suggested that his later style actually was so. He aped both the style of Richter and his own father's talk.

and that man's scope" that we may hold him to have been from the first, even "when in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes," an artist in his own right.

Who will, then, may still argue that in his growth there was a cataclysm, a sudden bursting of a chrysalis, releasing an imprisoned genius from the hardened husk of a slavish parodist. I submit that sheer commonsense is wholly on the side of the view that "Shake-scene," though truly an abnormal genius, evolved normally, and learned to write by using his own faculties. The claim founds on palpable facts. The opening scene-section of the GENTLEMEN, once more, is written in Shakespeare's *own* early verse-style, not in Greene's, which thenceforward pervades the play. Then Shakespeare re-wrote the first scene-section, as he re-wrote the opening speech of the ERRORS: he did not begin by writing in his own way and then abjectly relapse into a servile imitation of Greene. Why should he? If RICHARD II be his original work he has apparently begun by imitating, in the opening line, the third-rate Peele, before proceeding to imitate Marlowe and again to echo Peele; whereas, if he penned RICHARD III, he there had the courage to begin by imitating Marlowe *ore rotundo*, and soon humbly relapsed for a spell to an imitation of Kyd. If it were not that these theories of an "influence" taking the shape of sheer indiscriminate style-imitation in the early plays were still advanced by accomplished Shakespearean scholars as well as by others not so describable, I should be disposed to dismiss them as simply absurd. Taking them on their merits, I would submit that they are untenable.

Once more, however, it may be well to explain that there may be an "influence" that does not involve imitation. When Mr. Mackail writes[1] that in KING JOHN Shakespeare is still "writing like Marlowe," he is not to be supposed to allege that that play is Marlowese[2] in the sense in which the RICHARD plays and the HENRY VI

[1] British Academy Lecture on Shakespeare, p. 11.

[2] As we have seen, Mr. Mackail treats RICHARD II as something in Shakespeare's own manner, though it is incomparably more Marlovian than JOHN.

plays are so. In JOHN we have Shakespeare's deliberate modification of the "eloquent" style which had been imposed on the chronicle plays by Marlowe, the most eminent performer in that field,—a natural result in a play which was a deliberate re-writing of one produced by the Marlowe school. But only in the clearly re-written parts of RICHARD II do we find the style of JOHN. The bulk of the play has undergone no style-modification.

The real difficulty in this play is, as aforesaid, to be at times sure where we are reading Peele (or another imitator) and where Marlowe. For Peele does assuredly imitate Marlowe, as did Lodge, Kyd and so many more. All the dramatists of mere talent (for writing, that is: Kyd had a high gift for play-making) were stirred by the advent and progress of that potent and masterful spirit; and they all echoed him in their own ways, even as they and he echoed Spenser. Between flat Marlowe and tolerable Peele there would be small notable difference: and Marlowe could be flat, as Peele could at times surpass his average self. It is quite conceivable, for instance, that Peele wrote the "off scenes" in Act II, scene ii, of RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, in which Warwick, Edward, George and Richard talk at length while the battle is supposed to go on. The work might well be Peele's down to the entrance and soliloquy of Clifford, wounded. But there the hand changes. Marlowe is broadly traceable by a special energy of verse, a combined freedom and concision of diction (varied by expansive flights) within a definite line-movement, which were not congenital to his imitators. Peele is constitutionally flaccid; Lodge naturally stiff; Greene normally dilute and thinly nervous, copying Marlowe even in the Marlowesque SELIMUS only by way of weak violence and wordy brutality. In sum, the mass of the blank and rhymed verse of RICHARD II, apart from the handful of speeches where Shakespeare has effectively intervened, is essentially in the manner of Marlowe; while some of the worse is pretty much in the manner of Peele. That Shakespeare wrought both sorts *besides* writing in his own manner is, once for all, not a rational hypothesis.

The discrimination between Marlowe and his imitators is to be made mainly by the test of style. Mr. Edward Thomas, in his introduction to the EVERYMAN edition of Marlowe, writes that "it cannot be too carefully considered how easy it would have been for other men, especially Greene and Peele and Shakespeare, who were familiar—as who was not?—with Marlowe's style, to write like him, and still more so if they were collaborating with him." It was not so easy as all that,—save perhaps for Shakespeare. Peele and Greene and Kyd in their imitations never contrive to be greatly Marlovian. They attain the manner only in vehement passages. Peele may very well have written the opening speeches of the MASSACRE AT PARIS, which are but faintly suggestive of Marlowe; he could not have written the soliloquy of Guise in the second scene. Only in the previously-mentioned passages of EDWARD I does he seem to write pretty much like Marlowe in Marlowe's 'Ercles vein; and we cannot be quite sure that Marlowe did not there intervene. But he could never write a whole page at Marlowe's average vigour with any diversity of dialogue. *How* he imitates Marlowe may be seen from the passage in DAVID where he echoes Marlowe's opening scene in ALPHONSUS EMPEROR OF GERMANY (I, i, 34 sq.). Marlowe's work runs:—

> So I, not muffled in simplicity,
> Haste to the augur of my happiness
> To lay the ground of my ensuing wars.
> He learns his wisdom not by flight of birds,
> By prying into sacrificed beasts,
> By hares that cross the way, by howling wolves,
> By gazing on the starry element,
> Or vain imaginary calculations;
> But from a settled wisdom in itself,
> Which teacheth to be void of passion;
> To be religious as the ravenous wolf,
> Who loves the lamb for hunger and for prey,
> To threaten our inferiors with our looks,
> To flatter our superiors at our need,
> To be an outward saint, an inward devil;
> These are the lectures that my master reads.

Peele's imitation runs (DAVID AND BETHSABE, IV, ii):—

> Thou power
> That now art framing of the future world,
> Know'st all to come, not by the course of heaven,
> By frail conjectures of inferior signs,
> By monstrous floods, by flights and flocks of birds,
> By bowels of a sacrificed beast,
> Or by the figures of some hidden art;
> But by a true and natural presage,
> Laying the ground and perfect architect
> Of all our actions now before our eyes,
> From Adam to the end of Adam's seed.

Here we have plagiarism pure and simple, by one who could not hope to rival his copy. The soliloquy in ALPHONSUS is written with the very fling and line-movement, the easily vigorous expatiation of Marlowe positing one of his self-declared villains. In the imitation, Peele makes his David assure Jehovah that he, the Deity, knows the future, not by astrology or augury or magic divination, "but by a true and *natural presage*"—a formula which could hardly have occurred to the most indigent of poets save as an echo of verses that had impressed him.

Mr. Dugdale Sykes, staking all on the fact of the plain parallelism of phrase, will have it that Peele wrote *both* passages, because he finds in ALPHONSUS a number of passages that *may* confidently be ascribed to Peele. On the latter point we assent. But ALPHONSUS is plainly a composite work; and the style-test must be applied to control the clues of phrase, vocabulary and diction. By the style test, the opening scene, we maintain, is pure Marlowe, and wholly beyond the known capacity of Peele, as revealed in any of his signed or admitted plays.

Here, it may be, we come to a temporary deadlock, as between Mr. Sykes and those who may support him, on the one hand, and on the other those who recognise, here as elsewhere, a style-test which is irreducible by any inferences outside it. There are, as has been admitted, many passages as to which we may reasonably doubt whether they are Marlowe's or an imitator's. The passage before us is one as to which that doubt, in our view, cannot arise for a student who recognises the marks of a

style, of an outstanding manner and personality. If the soliloquy of Alphonsus be compared with the soliloquy of Guise in the MASSACRE, the soliloquy of Gloucester in RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, the dialogue of Young Spencer and Baldock in EDWARD II (I, i), and the soliloquy of Young Mortimer in the same play, v, iv, after the exit of Lighthorn, the issue becomes clear. If Peele wrote the ALPHONSUS soliloquy, either he has there contrived to imitate Marlowe to perfection and to the full height of his power in that vein, or Marlowe in EDWARD II and the MASSACRE is simply imitating Peele, and this alike in tone, manner, diction and versification. The rational solution, surely, lies in recognising Marlowe's hand in all the passages alike, and classing the passage in DAVID, with its far feebler line-movement and diction and its grotesquely inappropriate application, as an obvious plagiarism, which attempts only in one item to reproduce a Marlovian effect.

The residual inferences as to RICHARD II, then, would appear to be :—

1. That while Peele may be held either to have begun the play or to have collaborated-upon or revised it, the bulk of the "Marlovian" work is really Marlowe's own, in some degree revised by Shakespeare.

2. That while Gaunt's speech in praise of England in the main quite transcends anything achieved by Peele, it proceeds upon *motifs* frequently used by Peele previously; and its feeble conclusion tells of a draft prior to Shakespeare's handling. That draft may be thought more likely to be Peele's than Marlowe's. But Marlowe has only too many hasty stop-gap lines like the conclusion referred to.

3. Shakespeare's certain work in the play, though unquestionably "early," is already on a higher artistic plane, alike as to versification and psychology, than Marlowe's, to say nothing of Peele's. It is then irrational to suppose that when already capable of such work he would frame a *pastiche* of weak imitations.

4. At the same time we are not entitled to ascribe to him passages and sections in which a poorer versification

is yet coupled with a psychic handling of the King which is partly different from and in a measure superior, at points, to Marlowe's presentment of EDWARD II. Marlowe's total work exhibits an undenied progression in psychic and dramatic power, even if we agree in recognising his hand in RICHARD III, where the character-conception remains crude despite the culmination of energy in the total action. As apart from the occasional poetic and philosophic superiority lent to the utterance of Richard II by Shakespeare, there is nothing in the general presentment of Richard's character which should be reckoned impossible to the Marlowe of EDWARD II. In respect of its verse-technique it is clearly the later play; and with RICHARD III it may belong to the last year of his life.

When the apparent progression of Marlowe's work is broadly scanned, it will perhaps be found that the idea of his origination of RICHARD II is much less unlikely à priori than it may otherwise have seemed. There are grounds for holding him to have followed his initial TAMBURLAINE success with plays on Julius Cæsar,[1] on Hannibal,[2] and on the English hero-kings, Henry V[3] and Edward III. It was presumably after this procession of "conquering" types that he turned to the presentment of types of failure; and I would suggest that he might very well have done so with a certain zest, precisely on account of the limitations attaching to the other. For him who had handled Henry V and Edward III, and found the difficulty of making an interesting play out of mere strings of perils and victories, the career of an Edward II, and the variety of episode offered by the reign of Henry VI, would have positive attractions as play-themes.

He took to them, probably, after having already found in FAUSTUS and the JEW OF MALTA a relief from the eternal heroics of hero-plays. The demand for chronicle-plays seems to have been steady; and to hero-plays he

[1] See THE SHAKESPEARE CANON (Part I), p. 106 sq.

[2] See the Chorus Prologue of FAUSTUS, ll. 1-2. Mr. Ingram (CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE AND HIS ASSOCIATES, 1904, p. 133) overlooks this point when he makes FAUSTUS follow immediately upon TAMBURLAINE.

[3] See THE SHAKESPEARE CANON, Part I.

may have had to return after trying his force in other fields; but we may surmise that he had latterly more interest in the opportunities of character-study presented by the kings who were failures than in adding Richard III and Guise and Alphonsus to his gallery of supermen. Thus, as against the probably common assumption that the portrayal of the hysteria and weakness of a Richard II was a much more likely undertaking for Shakespeare than for him, it is critically reasonable to infer that he would be moved to develop the weak Richard more elaborately (if not more powerfully) than he had done the weak Edward II. To Richard III he might well return after RICHARD DUKE OF YORK had established the theatrical attraction of that personage, but it would consist with his whole progression that he should be willing to spend more psychology, and in general more poetic pains, on the weakling than on the hero-villain. As before noted, Dr. Briggs is doubtful over his suggestion that Marlowe was "unequal" to the portraiture of Richard; but he adds: "We may be sure that it would not greatly have interested him."[1] I have given, I think, adequate reasons to the contrary, over and above the heaped evidence from style, diction and substance, that he *did* write the bulk of the play.

Against such a presentment of Marlowe's evolution there will probably be urged the often iterated argument that we must not claim to crowd into Marlowe's short literary life many more plays than are actually ascribed to him by contemporary authority. But that objection has not been considerately grounded. We must assign to Marlowe some six years of busy dramatic production, 1587-1593, starting from a success which would establish a demand for his work. And if the doubter will ask himself how the poet was to make a living without writing at least three or four plays a year, he may see reason to admit that for Marlowe such an amount of production was quite possible. Ten pounds was reckoned a high price for a play when Jonson first received it; and however we may

[1] Ed. of EDWARD II, 1914, p. 182.

juggle with the money-values of the period as compared with those of our own,[1] we cannot pretend that a scholar could then live in London on less than £25 per annum. Greene is stated to have fraudulently sold his ORLANDO FURIOSO to two companies, and to have had twenty nobles (£6 13s. 4d.) from each.[2] Greene made money also by prose tales, which Marlowe did not;[3] and if Greene wrote for the Queen's Company "more than four other,"[4] Marlowe must be reckoned to have written many more plays than those collected as his by his editors.

The simple fact, noted by Professor Lounsbury, that Chettle is shown by Henslowe's Diary to have produced, between the beginning of 1598 and the end of 1602, "ten entire plays of his own, and in conjunction with others .... at least thirty, besides making additions to and alterations in nearly half-a-dozen more,"[5] would alone suffice to dispose of the conventional argument against ascribing to Marlowe, in whole or in part, many more plays than are collected under his name. There is no reason to doubt that he had as much facility as Chettle, or that he had either sufficient industry or sufficient appetite for what small luxury he could earn to produce on the scale of Chettle. It hardly needs the passage in HERO AND LEANDER (I, 470-72), vehemently commenting on the poverty of the man of letters, to let us know that the poet of TAMBURLAINE, FAUSTUS, and THE JEW was ill content with a mean income, and would earn what money he could.

Even, then, if we assign to him, besides the seven dramas given in his collected works, a HANNIBAL, a larger or smaller share in each of the HENRY VI plays, a JULIUS CÆSAR, a HENRY V, the main draft of EDWARD III,

[1] That Elizabethan money had from eight to ten times the purchasing power of ours is a common statement, never substantiated. The simple fact that Elizabethan eating-houses had a "shilling ordinary" is enough to dismiss it.

[2] Dyce's GREENE AND PEELE, p. 31.

[3] If he was ever an actor, it can have been only at his outset. Cp. Dyce, 1-vol. ed., p. xiv, and Ingram, p. 89.

[4] Nashe, STRANGE NEWES, 1592.

[5] THE FIRST EDITION OF SHAKESPEARE, 1906, p. 9.

RICHARD II, RICHARD III, and a share in TITUS and in ALPHONSUS EMPEROR OF GERMANY, eighteen in all, we bring the total only up to a rate of three plays per annum, less than the number absolutely needed to maintain him, and this by including at least six in which he only shared. That he either produced or shared-in four-and-twenty, I have no difficulty in believing. Facility of production is as plainly stamped upon his work as upon Shakespeare's; and it is in all conscience often enough sadly hasty. With all its faults, indeed, it is a memorable output; and when we remember what was the pre-Shakespearean stage upon which he flung it—how halting in conception and how weak in execution—our sense of his defects is far out-weighed by our vision of his power and fecundity. Only beside the white light of Shakespeare is his hot radiance dimmed. The attributions to him proposed in this and the previous volume, then, stand or fall upon the separate merits of each case : they are not to be dismissed on any mere presumption of lack of time for the output.

As little can the present attribution to him of RICHARD II be dismissed à priori on the score of any intellectual superiority in that play to EDWARD II. Shakespeare's superiority is abundantly revealed in KING JOHN. RICHARD II, on the contrary, is not merely loaded with Marlovian crudities to an extent that would make it, if his, a poor imitation of a multitude of Marlowe's faults : it is planned wholly on Marlovian lines, and, so far from revealing, as a whole, any vital difference of faculty, is undisguisedly a mere companion study to the other. The Shakespearean passages are, I submit, but touches on an alien work.

III

THE AUTHORSHIP OF "THE COMEDY OF ERRORS"

I. The Problem

Like Richard II and the Two Gentlemen, the Comedy of Errors was long ago impeached as an adaptation by Shakespeare of a prior play; and, as we have seen,[1] Ritson's dictum to that effect, though supported by Steevens, was summarily dismissed by Malone as baseless. If, however, the student has found any reason to think Ritson to any extent right as to the other plays he may be prepared to find that there is an arguable case as regards the Errors. Already, indeed, Ritson's view is endorsed by editors so far as regards the old-fashioned doggerel sections: Mr. Dover Wilson pronouncing that as to such doggerel in the Errors "we may safely hazard the conclusion that none of it is Shakespeare's."[2] This is now hardly resistible by the percipient reader. Grant White, after accepting Malone's view that Shakespeare proceeded on the old Plautine "Historie of Error" of 1577,[3] ventured to surmise that he used "for the *more* comic parts the doggerel verse in which the elder play was written"; and, greatly daring, added: "and perhaps adopted some of it, *with improvement*." Malone, as discoverer of the record of the Historie of Error, could complacently claim that Shakespeare probably found there his plot, without recourse to Plautus; but, not having himself surmised any

[1] Above, p. 2.

[2] Camb. Press ed. of play, p. 77.

[3] Of which Malone first traced the record.

non-Shakespearean matter save where it had been widely recognised before him, as in the HENRY VI trilogy and TITUS, could concede nothing new to Ritson and Steevens.

Yet an admitted use of an archaic play might be supposed to suggest that thence came the visibly archaic matter in ours. Grant White, without naming the subversive Ritson, and being quite sure about the wholly Shakespearean quality of the TWO GENTLEMEN, yet felt that nothing could be lost to Shakespeare's credit by admitting him to have possibly retained in the ERRORS some of the archaic "jigging" doggerel "with improvement." That any one should ever have seen a Shakespearean touch in any of it is a monition to us of the difficulty which faces every attempt to modify the temper of traditionism.

Difficult, then, must be the recommending of the thesis that, even as the more archaic parts of the ERRORS are probably in part a survival from a play written before blank verse had conquered the public stage, the bulk of the blank verse is a survival from a pre-Shakespearean re-cast, penned by one (or more) of the "academic" group on the basis of the older, somewhat as the TAMING OF A SHREW was written on the basis of a previous prose play made by actors.

After Malone had invoked the conservative spirit against Ritson and Steevens, orthodox acquiescence was as much *de rigueur* in regard to Shakespeare as in regard to Scripture. Seymour,[1] indeed, who was one of the first critics in the nineteenth century to note the significance of the double-ending as a style-mark, was emphatic as to the non-Shakespearean quality of the ERRORS. Where Steevens ventured only to say that Shakespeare had not written the whole play, Seymour remarked that that verdict,

> "though delivered, apparently, with the apprehension of risk, might safely be applied to almost any, even the best play in the catalogue of our poet's works. The truth is that very little of it can, by a discriminating reader, be fairly ascribed to Shake-

[1] E. H. Seymour, unnoticed in Dict. Nat. Biog.

> speare. His hand, indeed, is incidentally conspicuous; but the general style of thinking, diction and versification, is very unlike him; and rather resembles, sometimes, the manner of the author of Titus Andronicus; and sometimes his who furnished to our meliorating poet The Taming of A Shrew."[1]

The assignment of TITUS to a single hand is an inadequate judgment; but even that reference is not wholly astray; and we shall see cause, I think, to credit Seymour with a perception of qualities of style and versification denied to the prominent "Variorum men" in general, and, for that matter, rare among their successors. Apart from some of the judgments of Coleridge, who developed no critical method, the critical and editorial handling of Shakespeare has been in the main carried on without any perception of differences of *hand* in versification throughout the Folio. The assumption of its "authority" has, in fact, in large measure paralysed criticism; and though a broad "development" was recognised in the versification of the plays as a whole, the verse-analysis of HENRY VIII by Ingram, Spedding, and others was an almost solitary operation of the kind.

As to the ERRORS, the challenge of Ritson and Seymour was ignored after 1823; and Singer seems to have accepted even the doggerel when he wrote: "the general impression upon my mind is that the whole of the play is from the hand of Shakespeare," though what was in his mind was probably the homogeneity of the work after Scene i rather than any Shakespearean quality in the style. To the judgment of Verplanck the whole business of the play is done "with that continuous and unbroken spirit which could not have been kept up through a patchwork renovation and improvement of some inferior author"—a dictum which by an irrelevant estimate disposed of a problem which the critic had not seen, besides passing a bad judgment on that which he saw. The marked differences of form and diction, as between the doggerel sections and the others, *do* constitute a patchwork, which yet remains effective. Fleay, from whom one might have expected at least a recogni-

[1] REMARKS . . . UPON THE PLAYS OF SHAKESPEARE, 1805, ii, 422.

tion of the phenomena of the versification, disposed of the piece as "undoubtedly" Shakespeare's, while non-commitally noting that Ritson had doubted the doggerel.

And yet the problem of versification stares us in the face the moment we pass from the first to the second scene. In the first, we have three double-endings to 153 lines of blank-verse—2 per cent. Here the versification is early-Shakespearean, so far supporting the universal opinion that the play is one of Shakespeare's very earliest. (As usual, the piece is commonly dated about 1592 without a glance at the "first heir of my invention" in the dedication to the VENUS.) In the second scene, with a markedly different versification, the percentage at once leaps to 24, a proportion not reached in any undisputed play till AS YOU LIKE IT (25 : TIMON has 24), and never approached in the DREAM, the LABOUR, JOHN, or 1 HENRY IV. And this proportion is not very much above the average of the ERRORS. In IV, i, we have 19·6 per cent.; and in the fifth Act, as a whole, 19.

On these salient facts, nothing whatever was said by the school which in the last generation professed to see in the evolution of the double-ending a symptom of Shakespeare's technical progress. Furnivall[1] noted the difference between the verse of the opening scene of the ERRORS and that of HENRY VIII as to end-stopping, but had not a word to say on the differences between the first scene and the rest of the play as to double-endings. Nor did he even face fairly the data as to run-on lines. Stressing the smallness of the number in the passage he extracts, he does not mention that in the 153 blank-verse lines of the scene there are 31 not end-stopped—a far higher proportion than the 1 in 10·7 which he gives for the whole play. He has simply failed to note the existence of a problem that lay under his eyes, and this while professing to dwell on the verse problem in general. And that attitude of impercipience will doubtless be maintained by many of the present generation. Critics like Professor Schelling of Columbia, when challenged to face such data, dismiss the problem with

[1] Introd. to the Leopold Shakespeare.

a jibe. They will have nothing to do with questions which on their own account they never asked. Having done their work without giving a thought to such matters, they veto all such tests. If verse-tests are disturbing, down with verse-tests.

We can but invite the serious student, then, to look at the facts for himself. Furnivall dates the LABOUR first, the ERRORS second, the DREAM third, and the TWO GENTLEMEN fourth in order of production; though in the LABOUR as a whole we have only 7·7 per cent. of double-endings, in the ERRORS from 2 to 24, as aforesaid; in the DREAM only 7·3; and in the GENTLEMEN 18·4; whereafter we revert to the 6·3 of JOHN and the 5·1 of 1 HENRY IV, after the 19·5 of RICHARD III and the 11 of RICHARD II. For all this bewildering diversity, orthodoxy offers not even the semblance of an explanation; and some kind of solution must be sought if we are to make any pretence of facing the critical problems of the Canon. Having offered in the cases of the GENTLEMEN and RICHARD II and RICHARD III the solution of pre-Shakespearean originals, only in part re-written, we now proceed to seek on similar lines a solution for the verse-phenomena of the ERRORS.

II. THE VERSIFICATION

It is quite unnecessary, for the purpose of ascertaining the origination of our play, to spend time over Coleridge's vindication of it as a farce, in which improbabilities must be "granted." A farce it certainly is, with a perfectly serious introduction and a partly serious *dénouement*. But it is neither necessary nor justifiable to argue that Shakespeare in his nonage *would not* have written the farce,[1] though the introduction, recognisably his, is in a wholly different key. What we are alone entitled to argue is that he *did not* write it; that the bulk

[1] Ulrici remarks, as many readers must have done, on the odd fact that Antipholus of Syracuse, seeking his lost twin-brother, never suspects that Adriana may be that brother's wife. But Shakespeare could not have altered that if he would. Antipholus of Syracuse *must not* suspect; if he does, the play stops.

of the blank verse and probably the whole of the archaic doggerel is none of his; and that his share, after the opening scene, is limited to a small amount of re-writing. That the farce action is, as Verplanck contends, vigorously maintained to the end, nobody has ever disputed; and to discuss the merits of the farce as such were otiose. What we have here to weigh is what the commentators, after Ritson and Seymour, never consider at all.

In the case of the GENTLEMEN the quality of the verse, after the opening scene-section, was easily testable by simply contrasting it with the admittedly early verse of the LABOUR and the DREAM, commonly dated before it, and necessarily so, on the orthodox hypothesis, if any heed is to be paid to double-endings. In the case of the ERRORS the matter is equally clear if we date it subsequently to the LABOUR; for here too the verse we impugn is plainly more primitive in every respect than that of the unquestioned portions of the other play. It is energetic, but in a more elementary fashion. But if the ERRORS be placed, as by some, first in date of the comedies, the issue is complicated. Here, it may be claimed, we have Shakespeare at his outset in comedy, and here we may expect to find him producing verse not marked by the subtler qualities we find in the LABOUR and the DREAM.

At once, then, we have to note that while the verse of the opening scene is quite conceivably of Shakespeare's earliest, it is already marked, as aforesaid, by a fairly high percentage of run-on lines, while that of the second scene, which is typical of the bulk of the play, is as low in rhythmically run-on lines as it is high in double-endings. And this crux is insurmountable if we are to adhere to the Canon and also to have any regard at all to verse-qualities in forming any conception of what *is* Shakespeare's early manner.

It may be well at this stage to deal with a quaint theorem, propounded by a demi-semi-Baconian who combines a wistful concern for Baconian parallels with a conviction that he intuitively knows original "Shakespeare" wherever he has been in the habit of seeing it. Deliberately describing the tentative and guarded hypo-

thesis of Marlowe's origination of Antony's oration as an "announced conviction,"[1] this critic reaches, by a curious route, a position at which he "imagines it might be laid down generally that the more formal the utterance the less we shall find of double-endings and run-on lines. This explains Antony's speech. It is a set oration to a multitude from whom mentally he is at an infinite distance. He is, *consequently*, formal, and the formality is marked by end-stopped lines and the *absence* of double-endings."[2] The collector of "wills o' the wisp" has but to turn to the speeches of either Menenius or Coriolanus to the Roman mob to realise the ripe absurdity of the rule thus laid down. Othello addressing the Senate may or may not be supposed to feel superior to his audience; but he would seem at least to have been "formal"; and there again the rule is seen to be naught. In all three cases we have high rates of double-endings and run-on lines. And, be it further observed, there are many *more* double-endings in Antony's oration than in his apostrophe to Cæsar's body and his final soliloquy in the previous scene. In the 133 lines of the formal oration there are 24, that is, 18 per cent.;[3] in the apostrophe there is not one; in the soliloquy, only one. Yet again, in the dialogue of Antony and Octavius in IV, i, after the exit of Lepidus, a sufficiently "informal" situation, there are but four in 40 lines. It is indeed hard, by the way, to divine why an oration by a Roman general to plebeians should as such be supremely "formal." Antony's servant, giving his message to Brutus, might naturally be reckoned to speak formally. But he has six double-endings in 15 lines—40 per cent.

The folly of the formula may be further tested by turning to the opening soliloquy of RICHARD III and to Clarence's Dream. In the former, a "set" speech, the

[1] It was even accompanied by a tentative suggestion as to Drayton, and was expressly left open all round.

[2] WILL O' THE WISP, OR THE ELUSIVE SHAKESPEARE, by George Hookham, 1922, p. 142.

[3] In the previous volume of THE SHAKESPEARE CANON I put the percentage for the oration as 16, when I ought to have said "the oration scene." The percentage of 18 holds for the actual oration.

percentage is 32; in the first 100 lines of the scene it is 25; in the Dream, a very careful piece of writing, there are 12 in 54 lines—22 per cent. In the "To be" soliloquy, the first four lines have all double-endings. The theory that "formal" purpose, in the Folio plays and in drama in general, excludes at all stages much use of double-endings, and that "informal" conditions multiply them, is thus seen to be simple nonsense. If we find few in early Shakespearean verse of a grave kind, and many in grave verse of a later date, it must be a matter of evolution of the usage. In point of fact, the pre-Shakespeareans, like the Master, all begin with a low rate and increase it; and where we find a high rate in a play dateable as early—and such the ERRORS certainly is—alongside of work of his with a very low rate, we are bound either to surmise the presence of a pre-Shakespearean hand or to prove by other style-tests that the work with a high rate is his in spite of the anomalous and inexplicable multiplicity of double-endings.

To any mind not formed on Baconics, finally, it must seem difficult to understand why conversational verse should be less end-stopped than formal recital. Such an assumption, and such a conclusion, suggest that the reasoner had better leave such matters alone. In the opening scene of the ERRORS, with its grave narrative, we have as aforesaid some 20 per cent. of run-on lines; while in the second scene, with its "conversational talk," there are but four or five in the 105 lines. And though the actual running-on of the sense of lines is not infrequent, it is but to the extent of making the clause-pause at the end of the next or a third line: rarely yielding a rhythm-pause within the line. In the DREAM, the percentage of speeches which end within a line is 17·3; in

[1] Our theorist commits himself to the assertion that in Byron's MANFRED the double-endings are numerous in the "conversational" talk between Manfred and "the Hunters," adding that when Manfred harangues the Witch "we find only one double-ending in 40 lines, or 2·5 per cent.; and we actually have a run of 36 lines without any double-ending at all." To judge from his statistics, the Baconist has been trained as a tariff-reformer. There is only one Hunter in the piece; the dialogue between him and Manfred is as high-pitched as that between Manfred and the Witch; and in the first fifty lines of the scene with the Witch there are ten double-endings! In the closing speeches before the Witch withdraws, there are five in six lines.

the ERRORS it is only ·6. Let the verse be compared with that of the DREAM or the LABOUR as was done above in the case of the TWO GENTLEMEN, and it will be seen to be essentially of another fabric. It is indeed different from that of the GENTLEMEN, being distinctly less monotonous in its stresses and more forceful in its diction, but it is just as often end-stopped, the rhythm being so even when the clause runs on. It is vigorous, simple, forthright, at a high level of animation on its generally unpoetic plane: the action, save as regards Adriana and Luciana and the two parents, excludes poetry; and the effect, in dialogue, is as prosaic as it is vigorous. This is not Greene's hand, though Mr. Dover Wilson[1] remarks on the lines (I, i, 31-32):—

> A heavier task could not have been imposed
> Than I to speak my griefs unspeakable,

that "the construction of this sentence is reminiscent of Greene's work." It may be, but neither in this scene nor elsewhere is the blank-verse Greenean.[2] Whose hand then is it?

III. MARLOWE AND COMEDY

If we look among the pre-Shakespeareans whose work we know Shakespeare to have adapted, seeking for a blank-verse that is at once vigorous, fluent, and end-stopped in the fashion of the ERRORS, *and asking no other question*, we are with hardly a pause of hesitation led to Marlowe. Only a sense of the unlikelihood of his having written comedy can delay the verdict. But to suggest that Marlowe ever did attempt to write comedy is to clash with established opinion as sharply as is done in suggesting that he wrote scenes in rhyme; and in my own case sheer habit excluded all thought of finding Marlowe in comedy until verse-study forced the query. He had never been so thought of, save in one instance. If, however, it be granted that any case has been made

[1] Ed. cited, p. 88.

[2] My suggestion of Greene's name in SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN, p. 257, was made without due regard to the verse manner.

out for his authorship of the Talbot scenes in 1 HENRY VI, and of the similar rhymed work in RICHARD II, it may be conceded that the other unexpected challenge should at least have serious consideration. And as the thesis has in this case been reached in the same inductive fashion, with no preconception which could lead up to it, it may merit a hearing. My preconceptions in both cases, in fact, had pointed in the contrary direction—away from Marlowe

On account of its twofold form, I had rejected Fleay's early hypothesis, put in his MANUAL,[1] that the old SHREW had been "written by Shakespeare and Marlowe in conjunction for Lord Pembroke's company, Shakespeare writing the prose scenes and Marlowe the verse." That Shakespeare wrote the prose scenes was always an inadmissible surmise; and now that Mr. Dugdale Sykes has with great probability traced them to the actor Samuel Rowley,[2] it need hardly be discussed. But that Marlowe should have written the verse seemed à priori little more likely; and I preferred Fleay's final ascription of the play to Kyd,[3] spending much time in the attempt to verify it, while inclined also to look for a collaborator in Greene.[4] It is after failing to establish *that* line of preconception that I am led back by the evidence to the theory which Fleay framed and abandoned, as regards the verse; and I now regard the divagations as due to inattention to the main style-features of the verse in A SHREW,—an inattention resulting from the general assumption that Marlowe had no leaning to comedy.

So strong and so general has been that presumption that the actual naming of a lost comedy by Marlowe and Day in the Stationers' Register in 1654 has never been permitted to count for anything; and the unquestioned presence of a quantity of Marlowe matter in the old SHREW has never been allowed to set up any systematic

[1] Ed. 1876, p. 186.

[2] See his Shakespeare Association paper, "The Authorship of 'The Taming of A Shrew,'" etc., 1920.

[3] In his LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE and BIOG. CHRON.

[4] Malone "suspected" that the play was "by George Peele or Robert Greene," offering no reasons for either view.

inquiry as to his possible authorship. "The supposition that he was the author," writes Sir A. W. Ward, "rests on the entirely fallacious evidence of the plagiarisms from Marlowe which it undoubtedly contains: the comic humour which the play possesses in a singularly high degree was beyond all dispute foreign to the bent of Marlowe's genius."[1] This, however, is a dismissal of the case at sight, either on a *petitio principii* or in disregard of the obvious problem as to whether the verse and the prose came from the same hand. If the attribution be made solely on the ground of the actual Marlowe extracts embedded in the play, the hypothesis clearly cannot stand. Any imitator might have inserted such. But when Fleay, after others had posited an imitator, came to the view that the verse is all Marlowe's own, he must have seen something more to convince him than the traced "plagiarisms," which were before him all along. His reversion to the Kyd theory seems to have followed upon his later conclusion that Shakespeare never wrote for the Pembroke company; and upon the general rejection of his Marlowe ascription. In the same way, after surmising Marlowe as author of TITUS, he had put a hypothesis of Peele's authorship, and, receiving no support, had withdrawn it and reverted to the common one. The true solution, as I see it, is that both Peele and Marlowe had a hand in TITUS, and not they only. Fleay's surmise of Marlowe's presence in A SHREW, I take it, was as well founded as those others. What is necessary in all such cases is a patient testing of the hypothesis—a course to which Fleay was insufficiently disposed as regards the examination of styles.

He had, however, well summed up[2] that "Nothing is more safe than a conclusion founded on the *manner* of work, where the author shows development of style in his productions; nothing less sure than inferences from *matter*, or the relative value of it." That is to say, neither resemblance of theme nor coincidences of phrase

[1] HIST. OF ENG. DRAMAT. LIT., ed. 1899, i, 359.

[2] MANUAL, p. 181.

can by themselves justify any conclusion as to authorship. Unless there is a general and demonstrable coincidence of style—a term which strictly includes management of verse as well as diction and manner of clause construction—minor coincidences may be merely misleading, and actual reduplications of passages doubly so, though it should be added that where parallelisms of manner and matter *concur*, the presumption of a common source is greatly heightened. Kyd, Lodge, Peele and Greene all chronically imitated Marlowe; and any one of them might à priori have done the copying from him in A SHREW. The vital question is, does the general style of the blank verse point to any of them? And after much comparison one must pronounce in the negative. The versification is markedly freer than that of Lodge, at once freer and surer than that of Kyd, and more forceful than that of Greene, the only one of the four who could be compared with Marlowe on the point of fluency in blank verse. Thus it is to Marlowe that we are led on a general survey. The next step is to collate style samples. At the outset we must guard against the usual presupposition, which turns upon the habit of thinking of Marlowe as typified in TAMBURLAINE, where there is a minimum of comedy, albeit there are dashes of farce. In considering the possibility of his penning comedies or farces, we have to note the sections of his work which approximate to those planes. Now, while alien comic matter is justly to be specified in FAUSTUS, there is no reason to deny that the comic matter in the first Act is of Marlowe's own penning; and while that is prose, we have in the JEW both verse and prose on the planes of both comedy and farce—a circumstance apparently overlooked by Sir A. W. Ward when he pronounced the verdict above cited; and yet again, in EDWARD II, much verse at the level of serious comedy. It is on such matter—the episode of Ithamore, Pilia-Borsa and Bellamira in the JEW, and such a scene as that of Young Spencer and Baldock (II, i) in EDWARD II—that we must concentrate if we are to consider how Marlowe *would* write on the comedy plane of the verse portions of A SHREW. To begin with, they bar the

assumption that by reason of devotion to poetic tragedy he *would not* write comedy.

Only the rigid assumption that he *would not* can have dictated the pronouncement of the late Professor Raleigh[1] in regard to the old SHREW. "Among the writers who were then[2] writing for the stage," he observes, "we knew of only one man who was certainly capable of writing it, and that man is Shakespeare himself." Raleigh did not profess to hold by his own suggestion, which, he confesses, would in the absence of proof "only serve as a new sandy site for the fabric of conjecture." And he could not possibly offer proof for a hypothesis which wholly disregards the style test. In the old SHREW there is not a Shakespearean line.

The solution of such problems must be sought in a study of *all* the phenomena. When Raleigh writes[3] on them he does not really face them, but takes refuge thus in the mere negation of critical method :—

> "There is an attractive simplicity about the criticism which attributes all that is good to Shakespeare, and all that is bad to 'an inferior hand.' On this principle TITUS ANDRONICUS has been stoutly alleged to contain no single line of Shakespeare's composing. But if once we are foolishly persuaded to go behind the authority of Heminge and Condell (reinforced, in the case of TITUS, by the testimony of Francis Meres) we have lost our only *safe* anchorage (!), and are afloat upon a wild and violent sea, subject to every wind of doctrine."

It would be difficult to be more uncritically conservative. The esteemed Professor is so thralled by his blind rule that he does not even rightly state his problem. On his professed principle he must assign *every* (or nearly every) line of TITUS to Shakespeare; and his phrase "no single line" is pseudo-dialectic. For him, Shakespeare *must* have written :

> When I was mortal, my anointed body
> By thee was punchèd full of deadly holes :

[1] SHAKESPEARE, Men of Letters series, p. 111.

[2] Prof. Raleigh puts this after speaking of "the play of 1594." But he was not entitled to reckon that the date of *writing*. It was certainly played before its publication.

[3] As cited, p. 108.

in RICHARD III. His account of the critical test as attributing all that is "good" to Shakespeare, and everything "bad" to an inferior hand, is just as nugatory. It is not a question of "good" and "bad." There is good Shakespeare and bad Shakespeare. The question is, *What* is Shakespeare? And for this the Professor, by his own account, has no critical test whatever, but solely the bare word of the theatre-company, and of Meres, who, making up his lists of sixes, simply gave out the theatre-claim. The Folio later makes it for the HENRY VI plays, which Meres does not mention, though they are universally dated long before 1598. That problem the Professor helplessly ignores. TITUS he is content to regard as "a work of youthful bravado," not even summoning the aid of the Imitation Theory. And in the act of rejecting what he represents as a mere test of "good" and "bad," he uncritically propounds his admittedly futile hypothesis of Shakespeare's authorship of the old SHREW, precisely on the ground that that play is in a way "good." It is; but it is not in Shakespeare's way. And the implicit denial that its merit on the verse-side could have been due to Marlowe is of a piece with the whole eyeless and earless traditionary fashion of dealing with the anonymous pre-Shakespearean drama—the kind of exploration which is achieved by holding on for life to a "safe anchorage."

He who will fairly face the Marlowe hypothesis will reserve his judgment until he has scrutinised all the relevant data. It may indeed be felt at the very opening of A SHREW that the first key struck is one of burlesque. After the brief introduction of Sly we have:—

Enter a Nobleman and his men from hunting.

Lord. Now that the gloomy shadow of the night,
Longing to view Orion's drizzling looks,
Leaps from the antarctic world unto the sky,
And dims the welkin with her pitchy breath,
And darksome night o'ershades the crystal heavens,
Here break we off our hunting for the night;
Couple up the hounds and let us hie us home . . . . .

The first four lines are lifted bodily from FAUSTUS (I, iii,

1-4), where they clearly belong. Why, we may ask, should Marlowe thus parody himself? The question is natural, and it leads to an elucidation. The historic inference as to the play is that, like the FAMOUS VICTORIES OF HENRY FIFTH and the old RICHARD III., it was originally actor's work; and that when Marlowe and his group had lit the stage with a new attraction by their blank verse, the acting companies turned to them to give that virtue to their popular plays. Patronised as they all were by noblemen, it was natural that they should seek to associate their work with an attraction which counted for much with the cultured. And we can without difficulty conceive Marlowe, called upon to "poetise" the popular farce of THE TAMING OF A SHREW, going to work half humorously[1] by striking an opening key-note from his own most orotund verse. The decisive consideration is that the writing goes on in his own style[2]—the vigorous, fluent, line-ended rhythm, moving easily and harmoniously, comparatively free from the padding affected by all the others of the group:—

> Go, take him [Sly] up and bear him to my house,
> And bear him easily for fear he wake,
> And set a sumptuous banquet on the board,
> And put my richest garments on his back.

It is the normal Marlowe movement, freely not rigidly iambic, natural in construction, effortless, but end-stopped. The very succession of "and's" is characteristic. Compare:

> Then after that was I an usurer,
> And with extorting, cozening, forfeiting,
> And tricks belonging unto brokery,
> I filled the jails with bankrupts in a year,
> And with young orphans planted hospitals,
> And every moon made some or other mad,
> And now and then one hung himself for grief.
>
> JEW OF MALTA, II, ii.

[1] Just such a beginning is put by Kyd in the SPANISH TRAGEDY to the love scene in which Horatio is killed (II, iv).

[2] Kyd in ARDEN (III, ii) begins a scene with a Marlowesque passage put in the mouth of a ruffian. This is not a transcription. But there is no continuance of Marlovian verse. In 2 HENRY VI (IV, i) with a similar start, there is a continuance, though on a changed key.

I must entreat him, I must speak him fair,
And be a means to call home Gaveston:
And yet he'll ever doat on Gaveston;
And so am I for ever miserable. EDWARD II, I, iv.

And that's the cause that Guise so frowns at us,
And beats his brains to catch us in his trap.
MASSACRE AT PARIS, I, i.

Away with him, cut off his head and hands,
And send them for a present to the Pope;
And when this just revenge is finished,
Unto Montfaucon will we drag his corse;
And he, that living hated so the cross,
Shall, being dead, be hanged thereon in chains.
Id., I, vii.

Three winters shall he with the Rutiles war,
And in the end subdue them with his sword;
And full three summers shall he likewise waste
In managing those fierce barbarian minds.
DIDO, I, i.

And then from thence to Berkeley back again;
And by the way, to make him fret the more,
Speak curstly to him; and in any case
Let no man comfort him if he chance to weep.
EDWARD II, V, ii.

Always we have the normal, easily rapid and vigorous Marlovian movement. And as against the passages in A SHREW which are simply repetitions from Marlowe's plays—a kind of thing he was constantly doing in his signed plays—there are many which are as markedly Marlovian, yet new. As this:—

Mistress, you shall not need to buy of me,
For when I crossed the bubbling Canibey
And sailed along the crystal Hellespont,
I filled my coffers of the wealthy mines,
Where I did cause millions of labouring Moors
To undermine the caverns of the earth
To seek for strange and new-found precious stones,
And dive into the sea to gather pearl,
As fair as Juno offered Priam's son,
And you shall take your liberal choice of all.

Here, with a *rhythm* that remains end-stopped (the last syllable being always stressed) we have the same vigorous fluidity and a freedom of run-on sense that only Marlowe had at that stage reached. The fluency of Greene is recognisably different, and this is not his *matter*. And

there has been no transcription. Yet who will deny that it is as thoroughly Marlovian as this?—

> Then will we triumph, banquet and carouse;
> Cooks shall have pensions to provide us cates,
> And glut us with the dainties of the world;
> Lachryma Christi and Calabrian wines
> Shall common soldiers drink in quaffing bowls,
> And liquid gold (when we have conquered him)
> Mingled with coral and with orient pearl.
> Come, let us banquet and carouse the while.
>
> 2 TAMB., I, iii, end.

It is idle to say that the passage in A SHREW may have come from an imitator, unless demonstrable imitations can be produced to match this and a dozen more "purple patches" in the old play. And they cannot. The imitations of Marlowe by Lodge, Kyd, Greene and Peele we know: they consist in echoes of phrase and line, or short turgid flights in the Marlowe manner: not one of them has a passage of any length so easily Marlovian as that just cited. And if it be urged that, while this and much else in the play is Marlovian, there are verse sections of a much flatter kind which are not in his manner, the answer is that there is plenty of Marlowe's signed work in which the diction is as flat as it ever is here. Compare a mixed passage from A SHREW with one from DIDO or EDWARD II:—

> His tailor it may be hath been too slack
> In his apparel which he means to wear,
> For no questiòn but some fantastic suits
> He is determinèd to wear to-day,
> And richly powderèd with precious stones,
> Spotted with liquid gold thick set with pearl,
> And such he means shall be his wedding suits.
>
> A SHREW, Hazlitt's Sh. Lib., vi, 511.

> *Æneas.* Alas, sweet boy, thou must be still awhile,
> Till we have fire to dress the meat we killed.
> Gentle Achates, reach the tinder-box,
> That we may make a fire to warm us with,
> And roast our new-found victuals on this shore.
> *Venus.* See what strange arts necessity finds out:
> How near, my sweet Æneas, art thou driven.
> *Æneas.* Hold: take this candle, and go light a fire;
> You shall have leaves and windfall boughs enow
> Near to these woods, to roast your meat withal . . .
>
> DIDO, I, i.

Pembroke. My lord Mortimer, and you, my lords, each one,
To gratify the king's request therein
Touching the sending of this Gaveston,
Because his majesty so earnestly
Desires to see the man before his death,
I will upon mine honour undertake
To carry him and bring him back again,
Provided this, that you, my lord of Arundel
Will join with me.

EDWARD II, II, v.

Marlowe can "decline and fall" in his way, like another. What remains constant is the simple, forthright manner and construction of the verse. Whether Marlowe wrote absolutely all the blank verse, and whether he perchance wrote any of the prose, are questions hardly to be answered. There are verbal and phrasal clues to both Kyd and Greene, and at times the versification might be that of one of them. But that the bulk of the verse is Marlowe's will not now, I think, be denied by anyone who reads it without a blinding presupposition that it cannot be.

And if Marlowe wrote THE TAMING OF A SHREW on the basis of a prior actor's play, he may conceivably have written, on a similar basis, a COMEDY OF ERRORS which, with little revision, became the play assigned in the Folio to Shakespeare. Let the possibility be first candidly recognised, and there will be found a surprising amount of support for the hypothesis. For here, too, the movement of the bulk of the blank verse, after the opening scene, is just that easy and forcible end-stopped verse (end-stopped in rhythm even when the sense is run on) which we have sampled from A SHREW and his recognised plays.

IV. THE BLANK VERSE STYLE

It is well to separate the problems of the blank and the rhymed verse in the ERRORS, though both sorts, as distinguished from the doggerel, belong to the period of Shakespeare's nonage. Taken by itself, with no preconception, the blank verse in the second scene will be

admitted to move exactly as does that of the "level" speeches in A SHREW, as these :—

> Father, I leave my bonny Kate with you;
> Provide yourselves against our marriage day;
> For I must hie me to my country house
> In haste to see provision may be made
> To entertain my Kate when she doth come.
> This humour must I hold me to a while,
> To bridle and hold back my headstrong wife,
> With curbs of hunger, ease, and want of sleep.
> Nor sleep nor meat shall she enjoy to-night.
> I'll mew her up as men do mew their hawks,
> And make her gently come unto the lure.

or these in the JEW :—

> *Knight.* Grave Governor, listen not to his exclaims.
> Convert his mansion to a nunnery :
> His house will harbour many holy nuns.
> *Gov.* It shall be so. Now, officers, have you done?
> *Off.* Aye, my lord, we have seized upon the goods
> And wares of Barabas, which being valued
> Amount to more than all the wealth in Malta;
> And of the other we have seized half.
> *Gov.* Then we'll take order for the residue.
> *Bar.* Well then, my lord, say, are you satisfied?
> You have my goods, my money, and my wealth;
> My ships, my store, and all that I enjoyed;
> And, having all, you can request no more;
> Unless your unrelenting flinty hearts
> Suppress all pity in your strong breasts,
> And now shall move you to bereave my life.

The "lifting" touch in the diction here at the close is exactly matched in the opening speech of the First Merchant to Antipholus of Syracuse :—

> Therefore give out you are of Epidamnum,
> Lest that your goods too soon be confiscate.
> This very day a Syracusian merchant
> Is apprehended for arrival here;
> And not being able to try out his life,
> According to the statute of the town
> Dies ere the *weary sun*[1] set in the west.
> There is your money that I had to keep.

[1] The "weary sun" is as it were a Marlovian "property": at least I take it to be his in RICHARD III (v, iii, 19), seeing that we have the same idea suggested in: "Before he gain his easeful western beams," in RICHARD DUKE OF YORK (v, v). "Day-wearied sun" in JOHN (v, iv, 35) is Shakespeare's echo —and echo enough. The *three* uses cannot be his. But Marlowe habitually repeats such epithets and tropes: we have "aged sun" in DIDO, I, l. 159, and "pompous sun" in EDWARD III in a Marlovian passage (IV, v, 14); and in EDWARD II (IV, vi, 84) "the day grows *old*."

And in the closing speech of the scene we have the same qualities :

> Upon my life, by some device or other,
> This villain is o'er-raught of all my money.
> They say this town is full of cosenage;
> As, nimble jugglers that deceive the eye,
> Dark-working sorcerers that kill the mind,
> Soul-killing witches that deform the body,
> Disguised cheaters, prating mountebanks,
> And many such-like liberties of sin :
> If it prove so, I will be gone the sooner.
> I'll to the Centaur to go seek this slave :
> I greatly fear the money is not safe

—always the end-stopped line and rhythm, with four double-endings in eleven lines, and a mixture of prosaic and poetic that is thoroughly Marlovian. And to Marlowe, once for all, unless we can find another claimant for the blank-verse, we must ascribe that multiplication of double-endings, if we are to date the play in the early nineties. Neither in comedy nor in tragedy does Shakespeare so use them in any unchallengeable play of his first period; whereas Marlowe is seen not only inserting clusters of them in EDWARD II,[1] but reaching, as already noted, the percentage of 26 in the Lucan translation. And the verse here is not assignable to either Kyd or Greene, who took the cue from Marlowe before Shakespeare had started on systematic play-writing, and who alone could be thought of as framing such a blank-verse play in the early nineties. The sole alternative is another neck-or-nothing application of the Imitation Theory, ascribing to Shakespeare a wilful multiplication of Marlovian double-endings in Marlovian verse, at a time when he cared so little for the mode as to write or re-write the opening scene with a lower percentage than that of Marlowe's outset in TAMBURLAINE.

Unless the ERRORS be Marlowe's own recast of a prior play, we must pronounce it a deliberate imitation of his verse-manner save in the re-cast opening scene. The young Shakespeare, I think, wrote the series of quatrains

[1] Three in five lines in III, i; three in three lines in III, ii; four in seven lines in IV, ii—which seems to be a late addition.

in Act III, scene ii, and the couplets following, which have something of his music and his turn of phrase as we have them in the Sonnets; but, save for one or two passages where another hand seems to enter, the blank verse after the opening scene is mainly of one quality, and that Marlowe's. If there is an occasional collaborator in the blank verse (Kyd or Greene?), he does not go far. The clues of phrase and vocabulary are mainly to Marlowe, though on a first scrutiny, without thought of him, I noted[1] a small number which suggested Chapman. These indicate the snares of an induction which does not take other tests into account. The parallel between a line in the ERRORS (II, i, 88)

> That like a football you do spurn me thus,

and one in Chapman's version of the ILIAD (xi, 136):

> And let him like a football lie for every man to spurn,

is seductive; but it comes under the scope of Fleay's warning (too often disregarded by himself) that resemblances of matter are inconclusive as against resemblances of manner. Chapman may have been using Marlowe's trope; or it may have been common.[2] Marlowe, on the other hand, is to be traced by a blend of matter *and* manner. Every student must have noticed the passage in Act v in which Antipholus of Ephesus tells how

> They brought one Pinch, a hungry *lean-faced villain*
> A mere anatomy, a mountebank,
> A threadbare juggler and a fortune-teller
> A needy, *hollow-eyed*, *sharp-looking* wretch,
> A living dead man,

and recalled the parallel *genre*-portrait in THE JEW OF MALTA (IV, V):

> He sent a shaggy, tottered, staring slave
> That when he speaks draws out his grisly beard
> *And winds it twice or thrice about his ear;*
> Whose face has been a grindstone for men's swords;
> His hands are hacked, some fingers cut quite off . . .

[1] SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN, p. 257.

[2] There is, of course, no "football" in Homer (146-7). Chapman used it previously in CHARLEMAGNE, II, i, 61; and there, too, he used the "tennis" trope which he inserts in the 5th Odyssey, 431.

which in turn points back to Ithamore's sketch of the same personage in the previous scene :—

> "A fellow met me with *a muschatoes like a raven's wing*, and a dagger with a hilt like a warming pan, ... saluting me in such sort as if he had meant to make clean my boots with his lips."

Another sketch of this kind appears in Kyd's ARDEN OF FEVERSHAM (II, i, 49):—

> *Bradshaw.* A *lean-faced* writhen *knave*
> *Hawk-nosed* and very *hollow-eyed*,
> With mighty furrows in his stormy brows;
> Long hair down his shoulders curled;
> His chin was bare, but on his upper lip
> *A mutchado, which he wound about his ear.*
> *Will.* What apparel had he?
> *Bradshaw.* A watchet satin-doublet all-to torn,
> The inner side did bear the greater show;
> A pair of thread-bare velvet hose, seam rent,
> A worsted stocking rent above the shoe,
> A livery cloak, but all the lace was off;
> 'Twas bad, but yet it served to hide the plate.

Here, it is hardly possible to doubt, we are reading a piece of imitation, from another hand, with a different style. In Marlowe, the sketches are dashed-in with a quick force, maintaining the dramatic note: here we have a piece of systematic description elaborated for its own sake, in a scene in which narrative gets the upper hand, as so often happens with Kyd. And the imitation points at once to THE JEW and to the ERRORS. The "lean-faced writhen knave" chimes with the "lean-faced villain," alike "hollow-eyed"; the further detail that in the same sketches are sets of lines beginning with "A" cannot be a merely accidental parallel; while the figure of the ruffian in ARDEN is as such plainly copied from Marlowe's. Now, ARDEN was entered on the Stationers' Register on 3rd April, 1592, and published in that year; and if the ERRORS be Shakespeare's later work he is there deliberately and meticulously copying Kyd, yet in a far more free-flowing verse. When, however, we note that ARDEN certainly echoes the JEW, can we doubt that it is also echoing the ERRORS? It is in ARDEN alone that we have the air of imitation: the description becomes

laboured and undramatic, whereas in each of the other sketches it is natural and well-placed. Are we not then forced to the inference that the ERRORS preceded ARDEN, and that it was at this point penned by Marlowe?

Certainty on such a problem is not easily to be reached; but I submit that the natural inference would run: (1) the sketch in ARDEN is certainly at one point, and probably at another, an imitation: (2) it is unlikely to be at the second point an imitation by Kyd of his own work, though that is not à priori impossible; (3) it is strongly to be presumed that it is an imitation of another, seeing how much higher is the facility of execution alike in the JEW and in the ERRORS; (4) this other is à priori likely to be the author of the sketches in THE JEW, which are imitated at the same time. And when we note the free vigour of the whole versification in Act v of the ERRORS —a kind of bounding energy of movement never in his known work attained by Kyd at his best, and eminently characteristic of Marlowe—the inference surely becomes a strong one.

Once more, the only alternative is the exorbitant conception of a Shakespeare who (*a*) about 1592 or 1593 imitates at once Marlowe and Kyd as humbly as Kyd imitated Marlowe, and this in a Marlovian line-ended verse which yet has more double-endings than Kyd's, after an opening scene with a minimum percentage; or (*b*) who *before* 1592 thus freely employs double-endings and applies Marlowe's verse to farce-comedy.

If, on the other hand, we assign the first blank-verse recast of the ERRORS to Marlowe, all difficulties disappear. It is to be dated shortly before ARDEN—unless we are to suppose that Marlowe was echoing Kyd at the same time that Kyd was echoing him, and contriving to do so with the air of originality, while the air of imitation is wholly with Kyd. We are not indeed entitled to say that Marlowe would never echo his imitator. The Elizabethans in these matters were not rigorous; and at times[1] we cannot doubt that the greater poet is echoing the lesser. Here the chronology is decisive: the print-

[1] See THE SHAKESPEARE CANON, Part I, pp. 174-75.

ing of the SPANISH TRAGEDY was licensed in 1592; and though the first edition was suppressed, we must suppose the undated copy to have been issued soon after. That Marlowe, who actually shared rooms with Kyd in 1590-91, should at times imitate his comrade in a friendly fashion was almost a matter of course. But the style-test is equally decisive. Guise's soliloquy is beyond Kyd's literary reach; and the bounding fluency of the blank verse in the ERRORS is, as aforesaid, never found in Kyd. The grouping of epithets in the "A" lines in the ERRORS is on the face of the case much more likely to have been suggested by the similarly vigorous epithet-stringing in doggerel in IV, ii, which seems to belong to the original play—though this, too, is uncertain.

V. SPECIFIC CLUES TO MARLOWE

All question of Chapman now practically disappears. If we date the ERRORS 1591-2, he is out of the question as regards beginnings, and there remains only the possibility that he might have shared in a revision after Marlowe's death. But as against the one phrasal and the half-dozen vocabulary clues to him, which are unsupported by the style-test, we have for Marlowe, besides the outstanding evidence of the versification, a much larger number of clues of phrase and word. Among the more significant we note (IV, iii, 10-11):—

> Sure, these are but imaginary wiles,
> And Lapland sorcerers inhabit here.

—the one instance of "Lapland" in all the plays. Mr. Henry Cunningham was, I think, the first editor to note in this connection Marlowe's

> Lapland giants, trotting by our sides
> (FAUSTUS, I, i, 219)

—the earliest dramatic allusion of the kind. And the self-echo from the earlier line (III, ii, 161)

> There's none but witches do inhabit here,

is quite in Marlowe's way. In this case a mere geographical name, which in itself might signify nothing though

occurring once only in the Folio, is found to be a really significant clue. But the number of once-used words found only in this play, and traceable to Marlowe, would in itself, as in the case of RICHARD II, raise the question of his presence had it not been raised otherwise. As usual, a number are of small significance, whether as being "required" or as being expressions of freakishness in the characters; and a number of them which belong to the doggerel parts of the play might be regarded as irrelevant to the problem. Since, however, some even of these are found in Marlowe, it is fitting to keep them in view, in recognition of the possibility that he may have had a hand even there.

The list may for practical purposes be reduced to the following :—

Apparently
A-row
Ballast
Balsamum
Barrenness
Bodied
Chargeful
Countermands (vb.)
Dankish
Debted
Defeature
Diviner
Dry-foot
Elvish
Embellished
Excludes
Fallacy
Falsing
Fool-begged
Foolishness
Fortune-teller
Gilders (2)
Glimmer (sb.)
Heady-rash
Hollow-eyed
Housed
Hoy (sb.)
Incivility
Inquisitive (2)
Intricate
Mome
Monstrously
New-apparelled
Procrastinate
Raft
Sea-faring
Sere
Shrewish
Spare (=extra)
Sunder (in sunder)
Truant (vb.)
Wedding-ring
Well-acquainted
Well-dealing

Combinations such as the two last in the list are cited rather for illustration than for argument. They are so common in Elizabethan drama, every writer framing some at need, that we may expect to find once-used words of the kind in anybody's work; and so with terms beginning in "un," of which there are five special to this play in the Concordance. But of the more significant words we find the following in Marlowe :—

Apparently (IV, i, 78). Found in HERO AND LEANDER, II, 135.
Ballast (III, ii, 141). Both *ballass* and *ballassed* are found in DIDO, III, i.
Balsamum (IV, i, 89). This special form is found in Marlowe

(2 TAMB., IV, ii, 41). The forms *balsamo* and *balsome* or *balsam* occur in other Elizabethan plays.

Barrenness (III, ii, 123). In THE JEW, l. 396 (I, ii, 164).

Countermands (vb. IV, ii, 37). In 1 TAMB., I, ii; III, i, etc. ("Countermand" occurs elsewhere in the Folio only as a noun.—M. FOR M., IV, ii, 95, 100.)

Dry-foot (IV, ii, 39). In TAMBURLAINE, III, ii.

Elvish (II, ii, 192: a doubtful emendation. The word is not in the First Folio, and reads "elves" in the Second. Rejected by Globe Edd.) points to "elvish-marked" in RICHARD III, I, iii, 228.

Embellished (III, ii, 137). Found in 1 TAMB., l. 350 (I, ii).

Excludes (I, i, 10). Found in FAUSTUS, l. 1349 (Qq. 1604-11: see Tucker Brooke's ed.).

Fallacy (II, ii, 188) found in ALPHONSUS EMPEROR OF GERMANY, III, i, 67; also in the old RAIGNE OF JOHN (Part I, v, ii)—two markedly Marlovian passages.

Falsing (II, ii, 95). This verb, found also in Greene, occurs in 2 TAMB., III, v (l. 3590).

Foolishness (I, ii, 72). Used in EDWARD III (II, i, 40).

Guilders (I, i, 8;[1] IV, i, iv). Twice in FAUSTUS.

Housed (four times in ERRORS) occurs in EDWARD III, II, i, 382.

Hoy (IV, iii, 40). In EDWARD II, II, iv, 46.

Intricate (V, 269). In EDWARD III, IV, iii, 13; V, i, 152.

Shrewish (III, i, 2). In DIDO, I, i, 4.

In sunder (V, 249), found also in RICHARD III, IV, i, 34, but nowhere else in the Folio, is a Marlowism: see it in RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, I, iv; DIDO, III, i; JEW V, iii, 4.

Wedding-ring (II, ii, 139). In DIDO, III, iv, end.

In the foregoing list, the items vary in significance. "Guilders," for instance, might happen to be a popular or slang word at the time. But when we note that such normal terms as "barrenness," "foolishness," "excludes" and "embellished," occur only in this one play in all Shakespeare, and that they are all found in Marlowe, we have to admit a presumption of the presence of one writer, given to the use of those terms,—seeing that his *manner* is also present.

The larger the number of such instances, the stronger becomes the presumption, though the possibilities of coincidence cannot be so estimated as to give absolute confidence to the inference on this side. And there re-

[1] This is one of the very few instances in which a reference is omitted from Bartlett's Shakespeare Concordance.

mains the theoretic possibility that Marlowe had partly formed his vocabulary on a previous writer who had, among other things, penned this play. In the case of words such as "hoy," "dry-foot," and "countermands," which occur in the doggerel and quasi-archaic parts of the play, this possibility has to be reckoned with. But on the whole, seeing that some of those uses belong to his early work, it seems reasonable to concede that he may have put his hand even to parts of the archaic verse of the old play. On any view, the much larger number of clues to Marlowe as compared with those to Chapman cancels the hypothesis that the latter may have been draftsman. There are other verbal clues, outside of the "once-used word" limit. "Ireful" (v, i, 151), found only here and in 1 and 3 HENRY VI, has been noted above (p. 96) as a Marlowe word. In Act v, the servant who describes to Adriana her husband's beating of the maids and retaliation on the doctor tells of the singeing of the beard of the latter, adding:

> And ever as it blazed they threw on him
> Great pails of *puddled mire* to quench the hair.

"Puddled" is used metaphorically in OTHELLO; but in Marlowe's EDWARD II (v, iii) we have a crudely melodramatic (though quasi-historical) scene in which the imprisoned King is shaved by his tormentors "with *puddle water*"; and in the death scene he tells:

> There in *mire and puddle* have I stood
> This ten days space; and lest that I should sleep,
> One plays continually upon a drum.

Apparently the sensational expedient of the chronicle play suggested to its author the resort to the idea for farce-description, where he perhaps felt it to be more appropriate. The ERRORS giving in this case the secondary use of it,[2] we may now with some confidence place EDWARD II at least as early as 1591, having placed the other about 1591-2.

[1] We may, I think, deduce that a pail was used on the stage in the EDWARD II scene for the "channel water" employed, though the chronicle source speaks of a barber's basin.

[2] Since a transference of it from farce to tragedy is so much more unlikely than the contrary.

In the next scene-section, Antipholus of Ephesus, appealing to the Duke for justice, has the phrase: "When I bestrid thee in the wars." This form is found elsewhere in the Folio in early and late work. But when we see that the other early uses (2 HENRY VI, v, iii, 9; RICHARD II, v, v, 79) are in Marlovian plays, there is a strengthening presumption that it is a Marlowe word in all three cases. In TAMBURLAINE he uses it in reference to riding a horse—the sense in RICHARD II: in 2 HENRY VI and the ERRORS it applies to the act of protecting a man prostrate. As the word does not occur in the CONTENTION in the place corresponding to 2 HENRY VI, and Marlowe's use in TAMBURLAINE (Pt. II, I, iii, 37) applies only to riding, it cannot be said that the induction is complete; but I will add that I think the case for a revision by Marlowe of parts of HENRY VI can be otherwise made out.

Less open to dispute is the reference to Marlowe of the words *bespeak* and *bespoke* (ERRORS, III, ii, 176; IV, iii, 62; IV, iv, 139; V, 233), both in the still-subsisting force and in the peculiar Marlovian use=speak to. This we have assigned to him in the Talbot scenes of 1 HENRY VI. In the ERRORS we have "bespoke the officer" as well as "bespoke supper" and "bespeak a chain." The former is definitely Marlovian; but it does not follow that the normal use of the word is not his also. Indeed his special use of *bespeak* as=*speak-to* would be likely to make colleagues call his attention to the normal sense of the word; and the prose use in IV, iii, may belong to the foundation play. The line (IV, ii, 2):

> Mightst thou perceive austerely in his eye,

points to—

> I might perceive his eye in her eye lost,

in EDWARD III (II, i, 1), and here arises the difficulty that in that scene there are several phrasal clues to Greene; and that the last eleven lines of Lodowick's speech are quite in his manner. But the opening lines are hardly so; and when in the sestet cited-from in the ERRORS we find the line:

> Of his heart's *meteors tilting* in his face

(though Greene has somewhere a similar phrase) there is a strong presumption of Marlowe's hand, the line being so much in his manner. It must be confessed that the vehement speech of Adriana in II, ii, 112 sq., has a ring of Greene's quick iambic manner, and specially recalls what seems to be joint work of Greene and Marlowe in Act II of EDWARD III; but as to the "tilting" line there is a clear balance of presumption for Marlowe, who uses that verb at least six times. And "meteors tilting" points to "making the *meteors* . . . Run *tilting* round about the firmament" in 2 TAMB. (IV, ii, near end) and "tilt about the watery heavens" in 1 TAMB., III, ii. That Shakespeare felt he must write "his heart's meteors tilting in his face" *because* Marlowe had written of meteors tilting in the firmament is really not a plausible hypothesis: that Marlowe was here repeating himself as he had done in a hundred other places is entirely likely.

So does the special force of "incivility" (IV, iv, 49) occurring only here in the Folio, point to the "incivil outrages" of 1 TAMB., I, i, 48. It is hardly necessary to add that such combinations as "dark-working," "deep-divorcing," "ill-faced," "life-preserving," "secret false," "self-harming," "self-wrong," "well-acquainted," "well-dealing," are in the ordinary way of Elizabethan coinage, and may be any man's words. Marlowe, for instance, has "deep-persuading," "deep-entrenched," "well-advised," "self oaths," "self-wrought," "self-angry." The scansion "child-er-en" (V, i, 369), finally, is Marlovian and non-Shakespearean. It occurs nowhere else in the Folio, and Marlowe not only uses it in the JEW and in RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, but often has similar scansions, as "sec-e-ret" and "nosterils."

At times, however, vocabulary clues seem to point definitely to Shakespeare. Thus we find twice in the ERRORS (II, i, 98; V, 299) the uncommon word "defeatures"[1] (=decay or disfigurement of features), which, occurring nowhere else in the Folio, is yet used by Shakespeare with a similar force in the VENUS (l. 736). This word I do not recall in Marlowe; and the natural

[1] Used by Daniel, COMPLAINT OF ROSAMOND (1592), st. 54.

inference is that Shakespeare put his hand to the couplets at the end of II, i, and to Ægeon's dialogue at the dénouement—a thing likely enough seeing that he has re-written the opening scene. Ægeon's speech beginning "Not know my voice" has music enough to be conceivably work of his nonage; and the text here has an air of expansion. Shakespeare, we know, played old Adam in As You Like It.[1] He may very well, then, have played old Ægeon in the Errors, in which case he would here be giving himself a few poetic lines; after having written the part to his own taste in the opening scene. But as regards Adriana's rhymed speeches at the end of II, i, it is not easy to be sure that he originated them. The lines:

> If voluble and sharp discourse be marr'd,
> Unkindness blunts it [*sc.* wit] more than marble hard,

are hardly like him. And the *double* use of "defeatures" in the play, followed by its use in the Venus, suggests rather that he was in the latter and probably in one of the former instances echoing a stray term he had already heard in the theatre. While, again, he may be held to have re-touched the dialogue of Adriana and Antipholus of Syracuse in II, ii, the versification at the outset, and the "drop of water" figure (128-9), point to the previous use (I, ii, 35-36), and strongly suggest Marlowe, who so many times reverts to that trope.[2]

VI. Summary

Such issues remain obviously problematic. But when to the argument from clues of vocabulary, phrase, and figure, we add the salient testimony of manner and versification, we are, I think, committed to the conclusion here reached. Whereas all the cumulative verbal clues might be met by the argument that an unknown hand was the source not only of the vocabulary traced to Marlowe but of the words not traced to him, no such negative can reasonably be urged to the claim that the versification, especially the blank verse, points in the main strongly

[1] Cp. Lee, Life, ed. 1915, p. 88.

[2] 1 Tamb., III, i, 11; IV, i, 31; 2 Tamb., I, iii (Dyce, p. 35*b*); Hero and Leander, ii, 174, and instances noted above, p. 103.

and solely to Marlowe. That combination of one-line rhythm, energy of diction, and free use of double-endings at so early a date as 1591, indicates him and him alone; and if any reader will open-mindedly con the versification of Marlowe in the JEW and EDWARD II, and then proceed through A SHREW to the COMEDY OF ERRORS, he will, I think, become vitally conscious of a constant rhythmic factor, yielding a normal line-movement, as markedly individual as the gait of one individual in contrast with another's. Marlowe's stride is indeed a very noticeable one.

If such verse be still claimed to be the work of Shakespeare, the faithful must once more fall back on the Imitation Theory, deciding that here, as (on the same theory) in RICHARD II and RICHARD III, Shakespeare had planned to write as exactly as possible like Marlowe—after having had the courage to write in his own early manner in the opening recital. It seems unlikely, at least, that any student will now argue, with Simpson and Elze, that Shakespeare wrote thus *before* Marlowe. Simpson, whose faculty for fallacy was exceptional, put the proposition that the ERRORS was written about Christmas, 1585, or in the following year; and Elze, whose speculations are no more fortunate, follows up with the verdict that "it may undoubtedly be said to smack of the schoolroom, and to have in all probability been drawn up *in outline* while the poet was still living at Stratford, after the birth of his twin-children."[1] On Simpson's theory, Shakespeare was producing the most exactly Marlovian blank-verse before Marlowe had written any; having acquired the knack either in the schoolroom or in the Stratford domestic circle, and passing it on to Marlowe for use in TAMBURLAINE. Taking, as Ulrici was content to do, the early HISTORIE OF ERROR (recorded to have been played before Elizabeth a second time in 1583) as the presumptive basis of our play, we are bound in reason to date the latter *after* Marlowe had produced blank-verse plays, if we will preserve any semblance of plausibility in our chronology.

[1] WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, Eng. tr., pp. 310, 331.

The commentators are agreed as to placing it between 1589 and 1594, in respect of the Syracusan Dromio's allusion (III, ii) to France: "In her forehead, armed and reverted, making war against her heir," though even White's emendation of "revolted" does not quite get rid of Dr. Johnson's uncompromisingly physiological interpretation. On the accepted view that it refers to the Catholic resistance to the accession of Henri IV, whom Elizabeth was assisting with troops in 1591, the passage does not belong to the original pre-Marlovian play. It might thus be Marlowe's; and the best we can say for it and him is that, he being no great humorist, the lenity which has so long passed it as Shakespeare's may fitly be extended now to the real author, be he Marlowe or another. It might indeed be an addition to the original "Historie of Error," which was presumably on the boards until recast in the present play. If Shakespeare could leave it standing, with his usual tolerance of all forms of popular appeal, Marlowe might. The prose has no characteristic of either; and it is only the rather frequent occurrence of Marlowe words in the archaic sections that could lead us to put it down to him with any confidence. It is a strange faith that unquestioningly takes it for granted as of Shakespeare's origination, and presses into the service of the theory of his "legal accomplishments" the allusion in this section to "fine and recovery." When the student realises that that "legalism," occurring as it does in a portion of the dialogue which more than any other savours of actors' "gagging," so ill-composed is it with the rest, is nevertheless made a corner-stone of the "legal" theory by its devotees, he may see new reason for turning his back on traditionist methods and thinking for himself.

So thinking, he will choose for himself between the rational inference that the whole mass of Marlovian blank-verse is of Marlowe's penning and the desperate compromise which pictures Shakespeare, the supreme master of blank-verse, as composing a series of plays all in the exact verse-manner of somebody else, *after* having forged his own great instrument and used it on occasion.

IV

THE PROBLEM OF "MEASURE FOR MEASURE"

I. The Play as a Whole

Measure for Measure sets up for most of us one of the most perplexing problems in the Canon. It contains some of Shakespeare's finest poetry, enshrining some of his most moving thought; as against much verse of a lower quality, and a quantity of prose which the latest editors pronounce to be in large part from another hand. It was probably of the verse that Coleridge was thinking when, avowing his dislike of the play, he declared it to be throughout Shakespeare's work; and it may be said at once that, save for certain passages, the blank verse seems to have been in some degree trimmed or edited by him throughout. At the same time the play is morally incoherent as an action, the ethic contradicting itself; markedly unequal in literary quality even as to the verse; and disturbingly diverse in its texture as between its serious and its farcical matter, the latter having no such relevance to the former as may be claimed to subsist in Hamlet. We have here a drama of which the main action is on one side so sombre in its criminality as to take the play, for us, out of the category of comedy, and to leave us wholly dissatisfied with the pardoning of the criminal; and the total effect is created by a procedure so anomalous on the part of the good characters as to enhance our dissatisfaction. Anomaly there is from the very start, when the Duke avows that he absents himself in order to secure a general punishment of those whom he has encouraged to sin:

> Sith 'twas my fault to give the people scope,
> 'Twould be my tyranny to strike and gall them
> For what I bid them do.

Law is attainted in the ruler's person; and his later procedure is but a stultification of himself.

Nor is the characterisation at all steadily firm, though criticism has sought to find mastery in its shortcomings. Mr. Arthur Symons, in an early essay,[1] wrote that he knew of "nothing more consummate" than the way in which the mind of Angelo is "led on, step by step, towards the traps still hidden from him," he being a man "fundamentally cold," who "in condemning Claudio condemns a sin which he sincerely abhors." This substantially follows Grant White's claim for the "individualization" of Angelo and the other characters of the play. And yet, while the verse of Angelo's self-communings appears to be certainly in part (albeit not wholly or fundamentally) Shakespeare's, one cannot assent to the vindication of the portrait as true to life. The man "fundamentally cold" would not have been suddenly heated to passion as Angelo is. One can understand the sketch as originally that of a draftsman who, more of a moralist and polemist than of a true character-artist, proposed to hold up to odium a Puritan type and the Puritan temper. And that idea is the more likely because the primary action, the setting in force of an alleged Draconic law against incontinence, would seem to have been suggested by the practice of Protestant Geneva rather than of any Renaissance State. As a law on the statute book of a city abounding in brothels it is fantastic. In the Italian story of Cinthio, the offence of the condemned youth is rape. In the foundation play of PROMOS AND CASSANDRA the law is framed "against adultery"; yet that is not the offence charged in the action. By the judge's account it is violation; by the sister's, simple ante-nuptial transgression. It is only in the Genevan practice that there is to be found any semblance of precedent for the juridical situation set forth in the play; and even Genevan practice fell short of this. As an attack on Puritanism, however, under the disguise of a picture of Catholic life, the first conception of the play and of Angelo is intelligible.

[1] On "Measure for Measure," rep. in STUDIES IN ELIZABETHAN DRAMA, 1920, p. 49.

But if we critically consider Angelo as a creation by a great dramatist, the sketch is not intelligible. As against Mr. Symons' eulogy of it one may fitly reply that Angelo is not a psychologically conceived or observed man at all, but a plot-puppet. There are no "progressive steps" in him: there is no time for progression: we have but an almost instantaneous leap from icy asceticism to brutal and murderous lust, and thence to murderous fraud. In the original tale as given by Cinthio (there are several variants) we get no suggestion of a man "fundamentally cold." That seems to arise from the purpose of presenting a type of repellent Puritan. In the foundation play of PROMOS AND CASSANDRA there is still no hint of a man "fundamentally cold"; though Promos is a greybeard with a character for "gravity"—and this term, be it observed, is mechanically retained in Angelo's soliloquy after his prayer. Promos charges the condemned brother with rape—falsely, the sister says, but still explicitly. He is in short a normal sinner in the first part of the episode, and though he struggles somewhat against his impulse there is no artistic illusion. In our play there is an attempt at it, but no adequate achievement.

As to the second step, the villainous breach of faith, for which if for anything a thinkable causation is wanted, we get next to nothing. Shakespeare, who could do anything imaginable, could conceivably have shown us a shamed sinner anxious not to follow up his lapse with a prodigy of wickedness, yet either driven by fear of open rebuke and disgrace, or spurred by a fury of reaction against himself, into a baseness that outsinks crime. But here we have only the bare old plot: "thus the thing happened." Angelo's avowed fear that Claudio, if allowed to live, might one day take vengeance, is an inadequate motive, in view of his confidence that Isabella's story would not be believed. The outcome is an Angelo so intolerably wicked that when, on an exposure following his brazen denial of his double guilt, as judge and man, he proclaims himself ready for and deserving of death, we cannot regard him as humanly contrite. To

spare him is to spare a rattlesnake. Yet this is the man assigned as welcome mate to the "sympathetic" and womanly Mariana, who in turn has to exhibit an indelicacy far less tolerable, on any view, than the lapse of the lovers. Shakespeare's pen has somehow intervened; but where, save in the poetry, is Shakespeare's spirit? Some argue that he has wholly moulded HAMLET to his mind: will any say as much here? Or will any, adhering blindly to the traditional Canon and assigning the inception to Shakespeare, maintain that the result is worthy of him?

Mr. E. K. Chambers, editing the play, candidly says: "It must be confessed that it is broken music, and that broken music is not the highest form of composition; but at least it takes on new interest when the harp from which it is struck is the heart of a Shakespeare." But what if the internal evidence should finally entitle us to suspect that the primary harp is not Shakespeare's heart at all, would not that be just as interesting a solution, besides being more satisfactory?

If, again, Isabella is "the largest-hearted and clearest-eyed heroine of Shakespeare,"[1] it is strange that she has had so few whole-hearted admirers.[2] If, on the other hand, the laudatory judgment be just, much of the credit must surely go to Whetstone, the author of the old PROMOS AND CASSANDRA. Shakespeare has added much poetry, and much detail, but has not adequately reconstructed the character to its changed action. Thus we have from one of the latest editors the verdict that

> "It lay within Shakespeare's power, at its best, to create an Isabella who should make the refusal and yet keep our sympathy along with our admiration. In the play, as we have it, he has not done this; and the trouble, to our thinking, lies in his failure to make Isabella a consistent character."[3]

[1] Symons, as cited, p. 46. It is hard to understand how anyone can so write with any recollection of Desdemona, Cordelia, and Imogen.

[2] Furnivall, who was rather heavy-handed in æsthetics, chimed with Mr. Symons. But Grant White, while extolling the characterization of the play, scolded Isabella through whole pages; and ever since Mrs. Lennox the balance of comment has gone in that direction.

[3] Sir A. Quiller Couch, in introduction to MEASURE FOR MEASURE, Camb. Univ. Press ed. 1922, p. xxxi.

Here we have the same kind of admission as is made by Mr. Chambers, the same ascription to Shakespeare of failure to master a serious artistic undertaking. Yet the play must be dated, for him, at a period when he was at the height of his power, with HAMLET just behind him, and the other great tragedies soon to come.

In the latest edition, Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch finds himself thus constrained to confess that the poet's dramatic genius has miscarried,[1] and that the play succeeds only by its poetry; this while ostensibly contending that the "comic" matter, which so many readers have found unworthy, is yet Shakespearean in respect of its substantial conformity with the "Bohemian" scenes in HENRY IV. Sir Arthur's able co-editor, Mr. Dover Wilson, does indeed reject some of the ribald matter in MEASURE FOR MEASURE as spurious; but much of the rest he claims as unquestionably Shakespearean in style and substance. We may perhaps usefully set out in our study by examination of this issue, beginning with the plea that Shakespeare was likely enough to introduce ribald scenes for their own sake.

II. UN-SHAKESPEAREAN ELEMENTS

As I see it, the question is not at all one of Shakespeare's willingness or unwillingness to make comedy matter out of the disreputable. Doll Tearsheet and Mrs. Quickly, as Sir Arthur claims, are there to settle such a question, if anyone were heedless enough to raise it. But the real problem surely is this: Is the ribald matter of MEASURE FOR MEASURE such in quality as Shakespeare could—let us say, would—have made it had he taken the matter in hand? And some of us promptly and confidently answer that it is not. Mr. Dover Wilson gives up, with contempt, the "fooling" of Lucio "and

[1] Though he quotes with approbation (p. xxvi) the strange judgment of Pater that the play "in its ethics is an epitome of Shakespeare's moral judgments." It would be difficult to force forward more uncompromisingly the challenge to our conception of Shakespeare that is involved in thus taking for granted as of his origination a morally anomalous play, in face of the fact that two out of three of the plays in the Folio are either admittedly or presumptively *not* of his origination.

two gentlemen" in the second scene, up to the entry of Mistress Overdone; but, noting first how that lady at her entrance tells of Claudio's arrest, and immediately afterwards, on the entrance of Pompey, shows complete ignorance concerning it, he justly infers a re-casting, and proceeds to assign to Shakespeare her talk from "Thus what with the war," down to her exit with Pompey, finding that some of the phrases "possess the very hall-mark of Shakespeare's quality," and setting down the contradiction to the muddling of a reviser. "Possibly by another hand," is his guarded expression at p. 99; but as all the talk of the Lucio group has been dismissed as worthless, the implication is that another hand is concerned.

Now, the ribaldries which Mr. Wilson accepts as Shakespearean will probably be pronounced by many to be of little better quality than those which he dismisses. The dialogue of Doll and Falstaff in HENRY IV. is the high-water mark of that kind of thing in the Elizabethan drama; this is certainly far below it; and the same verdict will by many be pronounced on the long scene in which Escalus so affably communes with Elbow and Pompey, where also Mr. Wilson finds "the full Shakespearean flavour" up to the introduction of Froth. Again I demur. The Doll scenes, over and above their comic power, illustrate Falstaff, who broadly belongs to the play: this scene is the merest comic padding, at a low level of inspiration. Of course we are not entitled to take it as certain that Shakespeare's humorous vein had not run thin between 1598 and 1604, but neither are we entitled to believe that it had, on the bare ground that in a play of the latter year which on other grounds we may suspect as not of his planning there is some third-rate and worse comic matter.

For, however we may dispute about that portion of the material, we have from Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch not a mere admission, but in effect a contention, that some of the serious matter is non-Shakespearean. On the transition from the verse in the prison scene (III, i: which he treats as Shakespearean poetry even at the finish) to the prose conversation between the Duke and Isabella he

pronounces that "they not only drop plumb out of high poetry into prose: they fairly bottom prose in such Euphuistic lingo as this"—of the opening speeches of the section. This is surely an overcharge: the prose is at least not very far removed from some that is to be found in other plays—CYMBELINE and ANTONY, for instance. But it is certainly incongruous to the reader's eye and ear; and the change of medium seems to the reader unjustified and disconcerting, though in all likelihood it was made by the draftsman with an eye to relieving the tension of the preceding scene for the purposes of the stage.

Mr. Dover Wilson, whose careful analysis of structure is always illuminating, appears to hold the general view that in such a matter there has been a post-Shakespearean re-writing of verse into prose. Such a theory cannot be dismissed à priori. But there is a salient improbability in the notion that such treatment would have been meted out to ripe work of Shakespeare's either with his own consent in his lifetime or by his colleagues after his death. Mr. Wilson notes both curtailments and expansions elsewhere in our text, and with good reason. But neither he nor his co-editor suggests any clear reason for a reduction of Shakespearean verse to the prose animadverted upon by the latter. There is no saving of space: Shakespeare could easily have said in verse all that is here said, in fewer lines than are here given to prose; and whereas we can surmise expansion for purposes of comic relief in the Lucio matter of the later scenes, there is no conceivable stage gain from the expansion here, if expansion there be.

The hypothesis of a prose recast at this point being thus dissatisfying, it is reasonable to try another. Having regard to the general practice, we may not unreasonably infer, as aforesaid, that the resort to prose was deliberately made by the draftsman by way of securing a relief from the very high pressure of the storm of Isabella's fury, which had been the acme of a scene of already great emotional strain. And it seems gratuitous to assume that this consideration would not appeal to Shakespeare,

but would so far impress an adapter as to set him upon re-writing a quantity of Shakespeare's verse. The hypothesis of an original draft with prose scenes—at least with this prose scene—is obviously preferable.

On a general view of the *facies* of the play we note two main features already glanced at: (1) a mixing of prose and verse in serious scenes, and this not for the usual reason that common folks should talk prose while the cultured speak verse, but as a matter of caprice or fatigue on the part of the writer, where it is not a matter of relieving tension; and (2) a deliberate manufacture of ribald dialogue, unredeemed by any brilliance of wit or humour. The latter phenomenon has been above challenged as un-Shakespearean: the former at many points is no less so. Seeing, however, that we do have serious prose matter in some of the tragedies, the point had better be put on the concrete ground that in this play, notably in the prison scene above referred to, the transition from verse to prose is to a reader disconcerting. But such a transition is not necessarily the result of a revision of one man's work by another. It is an old practice, deriving from the Italian drama, and is resorted to by the pre-Shakespeareans as well as by their successors. If we turn to Chapman we find a more or less arbitrary alternation of blank and rhymed verse and prose in nearly every one of his comedies and in some of his tragedies, a single speaker frequently making the transitions in the same speech. And in Chapman we have in an equally notable degree the practice of salacious dialogue, as well as the introduction of scenes of bawdry. The ascription to him of the brothel scenes in PERICLES is *prima facie* suggested by his employment of Arsace and Temperance in THE WIDOW'S TEARS and MAY-DAY, though there the salacity is spread over the main action. If, then, the reader gives any tentative acceptance to the thesis that TIMON OF ATHENS is a partial recast by Shakespeare of a draft by Chapman,[1] he may be prepared to consider the theory that MEASURE FOR MEASURE is in similar case, though here the revision has been carried further.

[1] See the author's SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN, 1917, pp. 123-181.

III. Re-construction or Bad Construction?

Our argument may start with the second scene, and proceed to the prose scene-section between the Duke and Isabella. The second scene, so justly disparaged by Mr. Dover Wilson, is not easily to be conceived as permitted by Shakespeare to be foisted for its own sake into a considered play of his own in his lifetime; and, on Mr. Wilson's view, the allusion to the King of Hungary's peace dates itself after 1606.[1] But when we further note, with assent, Mr. Wilson's comment that the first scene opens abruptly, we are led to ask whether Shakespeare may not have been at the outset curtailing a too lengthy opening exposition by someone else. Such an exposition he would have been likely to find in any Chapman play. But, on the other hand, we have to note that the opening scene is no more abrupt than that of the primary Promos and Cassandra; and in any case we can easily conceive him as leaving uncancelled the second scene, which gives a quick transition to the main action and supplies "topical" matter that is at least vivacious. As regards, however, the flat contradiction between Mistress Overdone's first announcement and later ignorance of the arrest of Claudio, we must surmise that either a reviser or the original author had inserted her mention of the arrest by way of dispensing with the Pompey part of the dialogue, and, as visibly happened in other plays,[2] has obliviously left both of the incompatible versions standing.

On this view, the second scene originally opened with a soliloquy by Overdone, now curtailed (it begins with "Thus"), even as the second scene of Promos and Cassandra opens with a soliloquy by Lamia; and the matter now preceding it was inserted by way of introducing Lucio as well as producing "sparkle." But all this may have been done by an original author who was not Shakespeare, and who submitted to the Shakespeare company a draft with alternatives.

[1] Grant White held the period to be indicated by that allusion as the fifteenth century.

[2] See The Shakespeare Canon, Part I, 1922, pp. 51-65, 87 sq.

And that this play proceeds upon a hasty draft, by a hasty writer, is suggested by many of its features. The central flaw, ruinous to the piece as a moral whole, is the bi-frontal structure, Claudio being treated by his sister and the Duke as guilty of a grave and punishable sin, while these two moralists proceed to plan the committal of the very same act by Angelo and Mariana. For Claudio had been "contracted" to Julietta exactly as Angelo had been to Mariana; and the Duke expressly declares to the latter, in his character of spiritual adviser, "To bring you thus together 'tis no sin." What makes the situation the more fantastic is that marriage has been delayed in both cases for exactly the same reason, the non-production when required of the girl's dowry. Now, it cannot well be supposed that all this duplication was the work of a reviser of Shakespeare's play in Shakespeare's day or any other. Can it then be supposed that it was all of Shakespeare's own planning? If it were, we might fitly develop the jesting suggestion of Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch as to a temporary upset of Shakespeare's judgment by the Dark Lady or another. Mr. Stopford Brooke,[1] chiming with Hallam,[2] explains the unpleasant substance and unequal texture of the play by the suggestion that "there was a twist in Shakespeare's life at this time, of which we know nothing, and which turned into gloom and into a transient cynicism the charming nature of the man." Conjecturally dating the play in 1606, Mr. Brooke inclines to relate it to TROILUS and TIMON.[3] But he also pronounces[4] that "whatever it was that troubled Shakespeare, it did not trouble his intellect or his imagination"; while he finds at the same time that the wavering quality of the power in the play—"now steady, now unsteady"—is partly due to the "wave of cynicism" seen in it and the two last mentioned.

However that may be, neither in the better poetry of this play nor in the poet's undoubted work of the period

[1] TEN MORE PLAYS OF SHAKESPEARE, 1913, p. 142.
[2] INTRODUCTION TO LIT. OF EUROPE, 10th ed., iii, 309.
[3] Vol. cited, p. 139.
[4] *Id.*, p. 143.

do we see any sign of mental collapse; and it is in every way more economical to try the hypothesis that the fundamental flaw in the very spine of the play is the work of a draftsman of bad judgment, whose bad judgment Shakespeare was yet not concerned to remedy at the vital point. This is an intelligible thesis: Mr. Symons' proposition that Shakespeare "slurred over, as best he could," a hopeless flaw in his own premeditated construction, is not so. And when Mr. Stopford Brooke, plainly specifying the blemishes of the play, declares that Shakespeare "did his best with it," he leaves us no less dissatisfied. The hypothesis of another draftsman, which none of the critics has contemplated, becomes the more urgent. The false feeling betrayed in the share given to Isabella in the expanded plot, we say, is non-Shakespearean: for him to default thus would be a negation of some of the qualities for which we most esteem him—qualities in which he normally transcends all the dramatists of that and the next age. Coleridge indeed writes:—

> "This play, which is Shakespeare's throughout, is to me the most painful—say rather, the only painful—part of his genuine works. The comic and the tragic parts border on the μιστηον —the one being disgusting, the other horrible; and the pardon and marriage of Angelo not merely baffles the strong indignant sense of justice—(for cruelty, with lust and damnable baseness, cannot be forgiven, because we cannot conceive them as being morally repented of)—but it is likewise degrading to the character of woman. . . . Of the counterbalancing beauties of MEASURE FOR MEASURE I need say nothing; for I have already remarked that the play is Shakespeare's throughout." [1]

Charles Knight, not easily wrought to such a judgment as is here passed on the matter of the play, wrote:—"This is a strong opinion; and upon the whole a just one. But it requires explanation"[2]—his explanation being, in sum, that "plots far more offensive became the subject of very popular dramas long after the times of Shakespeare";[3] and that Shakespeare, by introducing into a hackneyed story "a contrivance by which the heroine is

[1] LECTURES AND NOTES ON SHAKESPEARE, etc., Ashe's ed. 1883, pp. 299-300.

[2] STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE, 1849, p. 316.

[3] To this it might have been added that Dr. Johnson found no fault with the theme.

not sacrificed, preserves our respect for her." Here the challenge is simply missed. The gravamen is that Isabella lends herself to a plot which by her own code is unpardonable. Hunter is less accommodating :—

> "Few of Shakespeare's plays give so little pleasure as this. The fault is, in great measure, in the plot, which is improbable and disgusting. But the play wants character. The principal persons are unindividualized men and women, and it may be doubted whether they always exhibit the feeling which really belongs to the strange situations in which they are placed. The Friars are but the Friars of Romeo and Juliet revived; and the clowns, who are forced upon the stage, not brought into action by the necessities of the story, the least entertaining of their species. Yet the last Act is finely constructed."[1]

We are here on the trail of an investigation which may lead us to reconsider Coleridge's unqualified assignment of the entire play to Shakespeare. Grant White retorts[2] on Hunter that he (White) and others "find in their enjoyment of the transcendent poetry, the subtle and far-reaching thought, and the nicely discriminated characters of this play, an ample compensation for the consciousness that they have opposed their judgments even to that of Coleridge." But, after a vindication of the "individualisation" of the character of Angelo, which takes for granted that it is true to life, the defence resolves itself into the plea[3] that "the poetry of this play should ever protect it against such judgments as that passed by Mr. Hunter." This is no answer to those who acclaim the poetry as highly as does the critic, and yet find the structure, management, and conception of the play un-Shakespearean. It is but an anticipation of the recent critical demand that we shall feel that whatever Hamlet does is what "the real Hamlet" would do—that, in a word, we are to feel and not to reason. As against the position of Coleridge and Hunter there is open and there is invited a hypothesis which can account for great Shakespearean poetry in a play that repels by structure and matter which are essentially alien to the mind that

[1] NEW ILLUSTRATIONS OF SHAKESPEARE, 1845, i, 221.

[2] SHAKESPEARE'S SCHOLAR, 1854, p. 111.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 119.

wrought the poetry. And that hypothesis is primed by the very structure and matter in question.

IV. The Mismanagement of Time

Before, however, we come to the analysis, it is fair to say that one of the flaws in the plot construction is of a kind that we cannot confidently declare to be un-Shakespearean. Hallam, following Mrs. Charlotte Lennox,[1] expresses the perplexity which many must have felt as to the Duke and Mariana:—

> "There is great skill in the invention of Mariana, and without this the story could not have had anything like a satisfactory termination; yet it is never explained how the Duke had become acquainted with this secret, and, being acquainted with it, how he had preserved his esteem and confidence in Angelo."[2]

Upon this Grant White, with laborious asperity, comments that when a critic's eye takes so wide a range as Hallam's it may be unreasonable to expect him to examine everything in his wide field; adding:

> "But may we not reasonably ask that he shall not find fault for the absence of anything merely because he does not see it? Mariana gives ample evidence, in these lines, of the *manner* in which the Duke becomes acquainted with her story. It is the first we see of her: the Duke enters as a friar: and she speaks of him as a man of comfort who has '*often*' stilled her discontent. The Duke, *since he assumed his disguise*, has evidently seen her *frequently* in the discharge of the duties of his pretended calling; and thus has learned Angelo's secret and the woes of his victim. This also shows that a long time is supposed to elapse between the first scene of the play and the beginning of the fourth Act. If we follow the events closely, however, we shall find that only two days elapse between the arrest of Claudio and the opening of this Act. But a month may have elapsed between the first scene of the first Act and the arrest of Claudio. . . . . The first scene of this play is but a kind of Induction which furnishes the conditions of the action."[3]

A more reckless attack has seldom been penned. It may be guessed from the confused sentences elided from this extract that, after beginning his fling at Hallam,

[1] Shakespeare Illustrated, 1753, i, 29-32.

[2] Introduction to Lit. of Europe, 10th ed., iii, 307.

[3] Work cited, pp. 169-170.

White himself realized the falsity of his arrogant argument. The Duke meets Friar Thomas, asking for "secret harbour" and a friar's habit, in Act I, scene iii, *after* the arrest of Claudio, and after Claudio's appeal to Lucio to enlist Isabella's aid. As White admits, only two days elapse between this and the beginning of Act IV. Then Hallam is right, and White aggressively wrong. His outbreak is one of many instances of the heedless haste with which he often worked—denouncing as useless the emendatory work of commentators in a book in which he has many times over to admit its utility, he himself offering many emendations after decrying all as needless, and many times unknowingly repeating other men's suggestions after belittling their suggestions in mass without examination.

Hallam's criticism holds; and it raises the question, Is this careless handling of construction originally Shakespeare's? Was it in his way of imagination to make the Duke of two days before, donning for the first time a friar's habit,[1] become in that interval one who had, as priestly adviser, "often" stilled Mariana's discontent? Has something been dropped from an original action, or has this action been thrust upon a prior play with this mere defiance of possibility? As already said, we cannot reply with confidence that such impossible telescoping of action is un-Shakespearean. It happens in the earlier part of OTHELLO; it happens in JULIUS CÆSAR;[2] and though in the latter play it may reasonably be surmised to be an outcome of a process of compression of two plays into one, we cannot assert that Shakespeare was heedful to guard against such lapses. He may have relied on the illusion of the stage to make audiences oblivious of them. Nevertheless, as in JULIUS CÆSAR, the impossible compression of time in MEASURE FOR MEASURE consists with a hypothesis of adaptation of a

[1] Mr. Stopford Brooke, criticising the character of the Duke, puts it as unquestionable that he "knows, even when he hands the government over to Angelo, the dishonourable way in which Angelo had some years before acted towards Mariana." But on this view the Duke had *previously* played the part of a friar confessor; and the anomaly of the Duke's action becomes doubly bewildering.

[2] See THE SHAKESPEARE CANON, Part I, pp. 81-82.

prior play; and to the question of the existence of such a play we have to address ourselves. The procedure is of the same nature as that forced upon us in the case of HAMLET when we are sufficiently concerned over the perplexities of that play to seek to know its genesis and growth. As in that case, so here, we shall doubtless be told that the play is "not worth understanding" if it is so burdened by a heritage from another as to be critically comprehended only in the light of that. And, as before, we invite the reader to judge for himself.

V. THE CHAPMAN HYPOTHESIS

As every student knows, our play is 'demonstrably founded' upon the archaic and never-staged but vigorous two-part drama of PROMOS AND CASSANDRA by Whetstone (1578), founded on Cinthio, in which Cassandra (Isabella) actually yields to the "corrupt deputy" to save her brother's life; and is betrayed by him as Angelo believes himself to be betraying Isabella; though there as here the brother escapes—an innovation upon the Italian story. In the old play, Promos (Angelo) is at the close compelled to marry Cassandra, who is thus technically rehabilitated, while Angelo is condemned to be immediately thereafter executed. Of course, however, he is pardoned, on Cassandra's and her brother's suing. The draftsman of MEASURE FOR MEASURE, it is evident, felt that the episode as it stood in the old play was too crude even for his period; but, instead of sensibly deciding to leave it alone as unmanageable, bethought him of introducing the Mariana machinery, not counting the cost of making Isabella, the vestal, actively connive at what she regards as a sin at best to be viewed with mercy when actually committed. Every canon of consistency is smashed for the sake of a dramatic *coup* on a par with that of Helena in ALL'S WELL. Now, the fact that there

[1] Mr. Stopford Brooke notes (p. 141) that "an old play, PROMOS AND CASSANDRA is *said* to be Shakespeare's original." There can be no rational question that it *is* the original of our play, whether or not there were intervening hands between it and Shakespeare.

are many and strong reasons for connecting Chapman with that other repugnant comedy[1] is for us a preliminary reason in favour of a hypothesis of his presence in MEASURE FOR MEASURE, though the reference back will doubtless heighten the distrust of a reader loth to admit the hypothesis in either case. But it is not necessary to stake the thesis as to MEASURE FOR MEASURE upon the thesis as to ALL'S WELL. For Chapman's presence in our play we shall find a mass of evidence in character-conception, method, vocabulary, style, and phrase. And the broad fact holds, to begin with, that Chapman is the contemporary dramatist whose general lack of judgment on the one hand and whose style and dramatic methods on the other are most plausibly to be associated with the shaping of either play as it stands.

It has indeed been urged in a previous study that the framing of plays in which we are asked to pardon the unpardonable had also been a specialty of Greene's; and we have on that as well as on much more decisive grounds represented him as the draftsman of the TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA, and also as probably the primary draftsman of ALL'S WELL. A priori, then, Greene, the most prolific comedy-maker of his day, might be a first draftsman of MEASURE FOR MEASURE; and when Mr. Dover Wilson suggests that there may be an "old" play founded on Whetstone's, intermediate between that and ours, we naturally think of Greene as a possible operator. But we have to remember that the pardoning of the wicked judge is the upshot of the PROMOS play; and whereas there are very strong documentary grounds for connecting Chapman with MEASURE FOR MEASURE, and for connecting Greene with the TWO GENTLEMEN as hereinbefore set forth, and with ALL'S WELL as shown elsewhere,[2] I can see only a few slight grounds for connecting him with MEASURE FOR MEASURE. The quality of the verse in Act v, in which Mr. Wilson finds an archaic smack, is really quite compatible with Chapman's authorship; and if there ever was an intermediate play by Greene it is

[1] See SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN, pp. 262-272.

[2] See SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN, pp. 266-272.

practically untraceable in the palimpsest before us. On the other hand, the anomalous ethic of our play is all equally compatible with Chapman's authorship. He, as it happens, exhibits in his signed plays the disposition to pillory Puritans[1] which would suffice to motive the sketch of Angelo;[2] as he was certainly capable of the Isabella-Mariana plot. He had some fantastic pseudo-delicacies —seen in his presentment of the platonic "mistress" idea in D'Olive—but no real or healthy delicacy of moral feeling. In Bussy d'Ambois he makes a priest quite seriously and with no sense of impropriety play go-between for the hero and the non-platonic mistress, a married woman; his vindication of St. Bartholomew's Day is a standing proof of his extravagance; and the fashion in which he makes Guise first the rabid antagonist of Bussy and then the adoring and adored patron of the brother who avenges Bussy's death is sufficient to convince us anew of his flightiness. The achiever of those flights was just the man to project *and to be satisfied with* the bifrontal procedure of Isabella and the Duke; and the bestowal of pardon on the unpardonable Angelo of our play is quite in keeping with Bussy's forgiveness of himself, and with the egregious scene in which Clermont and Tamyra (the Countess Montsurry) pronounce the craven Montsurry's dying speech "noble and Christian," after they have jointly compassed his death in revenge for his previous slaying of his wife's lover.

What is more, it is to Chapman that we could most confidently look for the temporary presentment of Isabella as *vierge féroce*, the furious denouncer of her brother for his pitiable appeal to her to sacrifice her chastity on his behalf. Generations of disturbed readers have plaintively or otherwise protested against her violence;[3] our reverence for Shakespeare having the

[1] Cp. Monsieur D'Olive, II, ii, 171 sq; An Humorous Day's Mirth, character of Florilla, *passim*.

[2] In All Fools (I, ii, 25) he puts in a woman's mouth the sentiment:

Too violent rigour
Tempts chastity as much as too much license.

[3] Grant White scolds her more whole-heartedly than anybody else, implying that Shakespeare meant us to dislike her.

effect of making us humbly remonstrant over matter in his alleged work which under another author's name we should simply dismiss as bad art. To make Isabella coarsely hint against the chastity of her own mother[1] by way of explaining the laxity of Claudio is a stroke so grossly offensive that it should alone serve to arouse suspicion as to the *provenance* of the play. Here there can be no question of a post-Shakespearean re-writing. It is either a pre-Shakespearean draftsman's work or a re-writing by Shakespeare, who has certainly written, as it stands, Claudio's speech on death, immediately preceding. Chapman could not have written either *that* or the Duke's speech on death, though he might have supplied some of the material. Never does he attain to that nobility of harmony in his signed work. But in Isabella's final speech there is really no sign, save in a terseness producible by revision, of Shakespeare's hand in the diction or the rhythm, any more than in the sentiment. "Beast, . . . faithless coward, . . . dishonest wretch . . . a kind of incest . . .Heaven shield my mother played my father fair. . . . A warped *slip of wilderness*. . . . Take my defiance; Die, perish," and the final scream—all this is violence without poetry, the violence of a poet without judgment, making a virgin champion chastity with the terms of a ruffianly roué. And this again is entirely in the way of Chapman, who could produce poems of hysterical and ascetic piety, execrating "filthy vice," in the intervals of producing plays stamped with lubricity.

It may be asked, Why, then, did Shakespeare leave such matter standing? Could not *he* detect at least as well as we can the falseness of the note? Could not *he* have given for Isabella some fitter reply? Could he not even transmute the reply made by Cassandra in the old play? The answer which suggests itself to me is perhaps too simple to give complete satisfaction. I take it that Shakespeare, perceiving at once the perversity of the central plot, felt that since that was irremediable, Isabella's violence might just as well stand. Two

[1] This was commented on by Mrs. Charlotte Lennox in 1753, but the point has been evaded by Isabella's admirers.

moralities were in any case involved: there might as well be three; and Isabella, who was soon to lead the "contracted" Mariana to Angelo's arms, might just as well declaim in the fashion here set down. He shrugged his shoulders, in short. It would all make a theatrically "good" raging scene of stage morality. If this be reckoned an inadequate explanation, the reader can comfortably fall back on his consciousness that his own moral and æsthetic taste is better than Shakespeare's, and "give Shakespeare out." But to some of us that solution is not open; and we reason accordingly.

Let the furious Isabella, we say, be compared with the furious Charlotte of THE REVENGE OF BUSSY, and they will perhaps be recognised as companion pictures from one artist, the former repainted only in part. Charlotte rages against her brother Clermont for not compassing more swiftly the killing of Montsurry in revenge for his killing of Bussy; and, fiercely contemning her men-folk as dilatory cowards, actually gets into male disguise in order to undertake the killing herself. It is as "unfeminine" a vision as that of the shouting Isabella, declaring she would rather have her brother die than live in any case: they are alike projections of extremes, by the poet of extremes, moral and physical, each outshrewing Xantippe. Chapman makes Clermont's platonic mistress weep herself *literally* blind in a day because he is put under arrest. Charlotte, the "brave virago, his manly sister," calls her brother Clermont a coward because he follows his own plan (she certainly has the excuse that he suddenly professes to repent of his undertaking to revenge their slain brother). After he has tranquilly kissed her, she shouts (III, i, 162):

> I would once
> Strip off my shame with my attire, and try
> If a poor woman, votist of revenge,
> Would not perform it with a precedent
> To all you bungling, foggy-spirited men;

and when he is actually fighting his duel to the death with Montsurry, she accuses him of letting the killing "stick in his fingers." When he has not only killed Montsurry,

but committed suicide on hearing of the death of the Guise, his patron, she cries (v, v, 199):

> Well done, my brother; I did love thee ever,
> But now adore thee. . . .,
> With my false husband live, and both these slain?
> Ere I return to him, I'll turn to earth;

and duly retires to a convent with the tear-blinded Countess of Cambrai. Here, surely is the very art that presents to us the virago-virgin Isabella of the prison scene. And Clermont's sudden pretence of repenting his undertaking is a plot-device notably in keeping with the ever-shifting attitude of the Duke in MEASURE FOR MEASURE.

That Isabella changes into a warm pleader for mercy is part of the charge of inconsistency against the character. Here we have certainly the great versification of Shakespeare, quite possibly re-writing Chapman matter, and if so, certainly doing it with zest. It is the more inconceivable that he either wrote or re-wrote the shrill declamation above discussed.

VI. QUESTIONS OF MANNER AND METHOD

What then of the prose scene in which the Duke, having overheard that outbreak, propounds to Isabella, and wins her to, his plot for the bringing together of Angelo and Mariana? The question here is at once one of style and one of substance. The substance, as already noted, is homogeneous with the planning of Helena in ALL'S WELL: it exhibits the same lack of right feeling, and the same absorption in ingenuity of plot. Is the euphuistic *style* then traceable to Chapman, irrespectively of the style in any part of ALL'S WELL? Mr. Dover Wilson argues (p. 108) that such phrases as "let me desire to know" (III, ii, 232); "let me desire you to make your answer before him" (III, ii, 150); "I do desire to learn" (IV, ii, 55); "I do make myself believe" (III, i, 198); "I am made to understand," "this I can let you under-

stand," are circumlocutions which "seem absurd in prose *but would be quite natural in verse*, more especially in the blank verse of Shakespeare's later years"—a criticism which will perhaps startle some Shakespeareans; though it is skilfully backed-up by the notation of the lines:

> I shall desire you, sir, to give me leave
> To have free speech with you, (I, i, 75-6)

and the phrases: "I am put to know" (I, i, 5); "I now must make you know" (I, iv, 22).

"Are we to suppose," asks Mr. Wilson, "that Shakespeare, who in 1611 was penning the lithe prose of THE TEMPEST,[1] had allowed his prose style in MEASURE FOR MEASURE to be temporarily corrupted by a *new-found* mannerism in verse? Or—that these scenes were produced by a reviser hurriedly working over Shakespearean verses *and translating them into prose*?" On this we ask first, as before, *Why* should this have been done, save on the unlikely hypothesis that an adapter saw, and that Shakespeare had not seen, the need for a letting down of tension after Isabella's wild outburst? Shakespeare could let down the tension in verse. Secondly, Is not this prose really in the very manner of much of the prose with which Chapman interlarded his comedies? And, thirdly, whatever may have been Shakespeare's practice, are we really justified in looking for less prolixity, or verbal circumlocution, in dramatic prose than in dramatic verse of that period?

If we make Chapman the test, we shall hardly reach such a conclusion. Opening EASTWARD HO in a scene-section (III, ii) assigned to him (justly I think) by Professor Parrott, we find Sir Petronel addressing Security:

> Well, my kind compeer, you have now the assurance we both can make you . . . . let me now entreat you . . . ;

and in the next scene we have:

> Pardon me, sweet cousin; my kind desire to see you before I went, made me so importunate to entreat your presence here.

[1] This argument appears to be of doubtful relevance. The prose in the TEMPEST is non-serious.

In AN HUMOROUS DAY'S MIRTH, again, we have such dialogue as this :—

> *Labervele.* Well, sir, what is your business?
> *Catalian.* Why, sir, I have a message to my lady from Monsieur du Barte.
> *Lab.* Your lady! well, sir, speak your mind to your lady.
> *Florilla.* You are very welcome, sir, and I pray how doth he?
> *Cat.* In health, madam, thanks be to God, commending his duty to your ladyship, and hath sent you a message which *I would desire* your honour to hear in private. . . . .
> *Flo.* "My duty to you" or "I desire you" were a great deal better than "my ladyship" or "my honour." Come, I will hear your message with all my heart. . . . .
> *Lab.* Well, sir, I will know your message.
> *Cat.* Why, you shall, sir, *if you be so desirous.*"

In ALL FOOLS (III, i) we have :—

> *Page.* Then give me leave to speak, sir, that hath all this while been silent; I have heard you with extreme patience: now therefore prick up your ears and vouchsafe me audience.

In the next Act Bellanora pleads :—

> Good Signor Cornelio, let us poor gentlewomen entreat you to forbear;

in the same scene we have the phrases :

> "Hearken you, mistress; gentlemen, mark I beseech you."
> "We will all mark you, sir, I warrant you."
> "I cannot but in kindness tell you that . . . ."

and in the next Act :

> "I must tell you plain as a friend, y'are an ass"; "Understand me," thrice; and "Do understand him."

In BYRON'S CONSPIRACY, again, Epernon begins a scene of prose trifling with :—

> "Sir, if it please you to be taught any courtship, take you to your stand."

It would thus appear that phrases of the kind Mr. Wilson would mark as belonging to blank verse were common in Chapman's prose dialogue. As it happens, Chapman does not commonly use prose for grave and serious communication in the serious drama he has signed; but there is such a scene-section in CÆSAR AND POMPEY; and there are several such scene-sections in THE WIDOW'S TEARS, as well as in situations in BUSSY D'AMBOIS, where the situation is below the higher levels

of declamation. In one of the latter instances we have such talk as:

> "Now mine own Pero, hast thou remembered me for the discovery I entreated thee to make of thy mistress?"

In SIR GILES GOOSECAP, again, there is some comparatively serious prose dialogue; and while the other prose talk may be described as purposely wordy, this is very much of the quality of the graver prose dialogue of the TEARS, which is noticeably akin to that of MEASURE FOR MEASURE. In sum, we are entitled to say that if Chapman resorted to prose in grave dialogue in this play he would phrase very much in the fashion of the scene under notice. In the TEARS (III, i), in a serious scene, we have this:—

> *Lycus.* Would any heart of adamant, for satisfaction of an ungrounded humour, rack a poor lady's innocence as you intend to do? It was a strange curiosity in that Emperor that ripped his mother's womb to see the place he lay in.
>
> *Lysander.* Come, do not load me with volumes of persuasion; I am resolved: if she be of gold she may abide the test: let's away. . . . I pray thee, wife, show but thyself a woman, and be silent: question no more the reason of my journey, which our great Viceroy's charge, urged in this letter, doth enforce me to.
>
> *Cynthia.* Let me but see that letter. There is something in this presaging blood of mine tells me this sudden journey can portend no good: resolve me, sweet: have not I given you cause of discontent, by some misprision, or want of fit observance? *Let me know*, that I may wreak myself upon myself:

whereupon Lysander replies in blank verse, which again is followed by prose dialogue. If that and other prose scenes be perused, it will be granted, I think, that the crisp prose movement and euphuistic manner, purport apart, are very much those of the first scene between the Duke and Isabella. As it happens, only one of the formulas reprehended by Mr. Dover Wilson occurs in this section. And if on these grounds we again urge the hypothesis that Chapman *drafted the play*, it does not appear that the hypothesis of a prose recast of Shakespeare's blank verse has any countervailing weight. The transition from verse to prose would be in Chapman's way; and the theory of the re-writing by Shakespeare, in part, of Chapman's verse in the earlier part of the scene

would explain everything, down to the un-Shakespearean quality of Isabella's invective immediately preceding the prose which he left untouched.

In sum, the argument of the Cambridge Press editors against the prose as being un-Shakespearean will chime with the argument that it is Chapman's; while our theory accounts also for the un-Shakespearean character of Isabella's outcry, which they can explain only by holding Shakespeare to have gravely miscarried. And surely ours is the more economical hypothesis, were it only because it excludes the improbable assumption that Shakespeare's fellows would call in anybody to turn his verse into prose, or that he himself would invite it. And the case is very much the same as regards the Duke's prose dialogues with Lucio and Escalus in Act III, scene ii. Mr. Wilson's argument there perhaps connects with his very reasonable theory that there has been an expansion of the Lucio matter, though his citation of three pleonastic phrases from this very dialogue in effect represents it as a re-writing of Shakespeare's verse. There are, in fact, as he remarks, scraps of verse in the prose, for instance:

> This would make mercy swear and play the tyrant.
> This fellow is a fellow of much licence.
> And have all charitable preparation.

But just such alternation of verse with prose, or sprinkling of prose with verse, occurs repeatedly in AN HUMOUROUS DAY'S MIRTH; and in one scene of that play (vii, 53-56) Prof. Parrott prints as prose a medley in which there are several blank-verse lines, seeing that the verse will not run throughout any one speech. Chapman, then, composed at times in the very fashion that is here explained as due to a recast. In THE WIDOW'S TEARS there is much more matter of the same kind. After Cynthia has answered Eros' prose at the end of v, ii, with a verse speech of ten lines in which four are short, scene iii opens with a medley beginning:—

> *1st Sold.* All pains are lost in hunting out this soldier.
> His fear (adding wings to his heels) outgoes us
> As far as the fresh hare the tired hounds.
> Who goes there?
> *2nd Sold.* A friend.

1st Sold. O, your success and mine touching this sentinel
Tells, I suppose, one tale: he's far enough,
I undertake, by this time.
2nd Sold. I blame him not: the law's severe, though just,
And cannot be dispensed.

The first soldier replies in eight lines of verse (printed in all editions as prose), and the second soldier continues thus:—

So we may chide the fire for burning us,
Or say the bee's not good because she stings:
'Tis not the body the law respects but the soldier's neglect, when the watch, the guard and safety of the city, is left abandoned to all hazards. But let him go; and tell me if your news sort with mine for Lycus, apprehended, they say, about Lysander's murther.

And in the same play, Act III, scene i, Cynthia in the middle of a prose scene speaks three lines of verse, and yet another; Lysander begins with a line of verse in reply, and continues in prose; later in the scene, Tharsalio interrupts prose with four lines of verse, then continues in prose; yet again, Lysander drops into verse in the midst of the prose:—

Forge any death, so you can force belief,
Say I was poison'd, drown'd.
Tharsalio. Hanged;

and Lysander continues in prose. Must we then surmise re-writing of his own play by Chapman here? It is possible; but if he did it here he could have done it himself in drafting MEASURE FOR MEASURE.

When, finally, Mr. Wilson argues that the "beautiful" line (IV, ii, 199):

Look, th' unfolding star calls up the shepherd,

occurring in the Duke's prose speech to the Provost, indicates there also a rewriting of verse into prose, and assumes that the verse had been Shakespeare's, we must again demur. There is no apparent or assigned reason for such a re-writing at this point, which could be motived only by an objection to verse as such; and the matter as a whole is fit for prose. The previous bad verse lines (167-8):

If my instructions may be your guide,
Let the Barnardine be this morning executed,

are exactly in the way of a Chapman medley, and are really not reasonably to be supposed Shakespeare's any more than the surrounding prose, while the "beautiful" line is quite within Chapman's compass. He may just about that time (though that is inessential) have been working on his version of the ODYSSEY, where (xiii, 142-3) we have:

> And when heaven's brightest star that first doth *call*
> The early morning *out*, advanc'd her head . . . ;

and he was quite capable of putting a line of poetry into a prose speech. In THE WIDOW'S TEARS (IV, i) Tharsalio begins a speech with a prose line:

> For all this, I'll not despair of my wager,

then falls into rhyme:

> These griefs that sound so loud, prove always light;
> True sorrow evermore keeps out of sight;

and then reverts to prose:

> This strain of mourning within a sepulchre, like an over-doing actor affects grossly,

—and so forth. Earlier in the scene, Lycus has declaimed about Cynthia's grief in poetic prose:

> "Her hands flew up to her head like Furies, hid all her beauties in her dishevelled hair" [a verse clause], "and wept as she would turn fountain . . . . Humanity broke loose from my heart, and streamed through mine eyes;"

and Tharsalio comments: "In prose, thou wept'st."

[This last word, by the way, suggests a comment on Mr. Wilson's protest that *exists* in our play (III, i, 20) should be left standing. "All modern editors print the monster 'exist'st': they could not pronounce it if they tried." Chapman evidently would try. He has not only "wept'st," but "learn'dst men," "suspect'st," "perfect'st," "desperat'st," "Solid'*st st*one," etc. And Mr. Wilson passes without a murmur "wholesom'*st sp*irits" (IV, ii, 73), which is quite as hard as "exist'st," and equally Chapmanesque.]

The same Tharsalio puts the line

> My sister may turn Niobe for love,

into one of his prose allocutions; and Lysander puts the line

> Huge monsters damn ye, and your whole creation,

into one of his. Thus when we find in our play (IV, i) the mixture:

> *Duke.* 'Tis good; though music oft hath such a charm
> To make bad good, and to provoke to harm.
> I pray you tell me, hath anybody inquired for me here to-day?
> Much upon this time have I promised here to meet,

we are dealing with a procedure that is very much in Chapman's manner, and is not in Shakespeare's manner, to say nothing of the matter.

And this holds good equally of the rhyming octosyllabics at the end of Act III of our play, which are so generally admitted to be non-Shakespearean. Even if the student refuses at this stage to grant to Chapman the authorship of the equally un-Shakespearean rhyming prologues in PERICLES,[1] there are special grounds for assigning to him the closely similar octosyllabics in MEASURE FOR MEASURE. The opening couplet:

> He who *the sword of heaven will bear*
> Should be holy as severe,

is a sentiment elaborated in BYRON'S TRAGEDY (IV, ii, 72):

> He should be born grey-headed that *will bear*
> *The sword of empire.* . . . .
> The soul's eye sharpened with that sacred light
> Of whom the sun itself is but a beam
> Must only give that judgment. O how much
> Err those kings then, that play with life and death,
> And nothing put into their serious states
> But humour and their lusts.

And though Mr. Wilson accepts Mr. H. C. Hart's reading of the "and" in the line:

> Grace to stand and virtue go,

as "an"="if" (an interpretation certainly often justified in other cases, since "an"="if" was often written "and") it may be doubted whether the emendation is here correct. For how could there be "*grace* to *stand* if virtue go," *i.e.*, collapse? The reading does not cure

[1] See SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN, pp. 185-192.

the asyndeton, which is so notably Chapmanesque—"should *be* holy . . . pattern . . . grace to stand"; and it is probable that the meaning was just the bad antithesis "grace to *stand*, virtue to *go*"—that is, to act. Such phrases as "By self-offences weighing" and "on the outward side" are further strong suggestions of Chapman's presence. And, once more, is it the more likely that these octosyllabics should be foisted into the play in a revision which aimed at *turning much verse into prose*, or that they were part of the original draft, by a writer who did employ such octosyllabics? Such lines[1] actually occur in THE GENTLEMAN USHER (Act II, near the end); and in them we find two Chapman words, *morality* and *nicety*, which occur only in MEASURE FOR MEASURE in all the Shakespeare plays. These are only two of many vocabulary clues in the play, to be considered hereafter; but, concurring as they do here with so many other clues, they notably strengthen the case for Chapman's primary authorship.

Seeing then that there is no reason save the occurrence in them of scraps of verse for supposing the prose-scenes in question to be recasts of verse-scenes, the argument for Chapman as draftsman, alternating verse with prose in a bustling play and putting scraps of verse into the prose, remains at once the more economical and the more satisfactory, while the theory of a wholesale rewriting of Shakespeare scenes by an adapter while Shakespeare was at the height of his power (for this appears to be involved in Mr. Wilson's dating of the inferred revision) becomes increasingly indigestible the more widely it is applied. The Chapman hypothesis, on the other hand, will be found to strengthen as it is developed.

All the signs of curtailment which Mr. Wilson notes in the play are perfectly compatible with the inference that Shakespeare is revising a Chapman draft. Curtailment would in that case be compulsory, for a serious Chapman play easily runs to 3,800 lines, and MEASURE FOR MEASURE stands at 2,800. And in every verse speech

[1] Compare the "Arguments" to the Books of Chapman's version of the ODYSSEY and the sestiads of HERO AND LEANDER.

by Chapman, Shakespeare would find cause to curtail if not to recast. The constant bane of Chapman's serious verse is its obscure verbiage—a torrential output of language that by its sheer perversity often defies interpretation. To Shakespeare it must have been an affliction; and when he was not transmuting it into harmonies that Chapman could never have compassed, he would of necessity be bent on trimming the contorted and diffuse diction into lucidity and brevity. In this fashion we can explain the aspect of every scene—the rewriting of most of the verse through three Acts, the retention of the prose parts, the leaving of Isabella's fierce tirade unchanged after Claudio's terror-struck appeal had been transfigured into pure Shakespearean verse; and thereafter, save for the incomparable song at the opening of Act IV, but an abbreviating revision to the close. This, on our view, is about all that the matter admitted of, save in so far as some good opportunities have been missed, apparently through sheer distaste for the plot. But how to explain a wholesale recasting of a Shakespeare play at the hands of his fellows, whether during his life, or after his death, seems to me to be more than any theory can propose.

VII. Points of Style and Substance

Returning to the problem of the ribald scenes, which so strongly recall those of Pericles, we have to ask whether they can reasonably be assigned to Chapman irrespectively of the grounded hypothesis that he had a hand in those. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch does not cite the Pericles scenes in his argument against those critics whom he supposes to deny Shakespeare's readiness to handle "improper" matter. They were, in fact, always viewed with suspicion, and seem to have been generally abandoned since Fleay split the play into Shakespearean and non-Shakespearean sections. And perhaps some may demur to the assigning of either those or the Measure for Measure scenes to Chapman. But Chapman's signed plays will be found to bear out the ascription, so far as matter goes.

That Chapman in his plays is lubricious will be denied

by no one who has read him. He set out on that path early, in his BLIND BEGGAR OF ALEXANDRIA, doubtless finding himself coerced to it by his economic needs, for the BEGGAR seems to have been a financial success. The same proclivity appears in AN HUMOUROUS DAY'S MIRTH; and while in D'OLIVE and ALL FOOLS and GOOSECAP he tries other modes of attraction, he reverts to the salacious in both MAY-DAY and THE WIDOW'S TEARS, notably in the latter. Bawds figure in both. These plays indeed rest their attraction for the groundlings on their whole plot, whereas in MEASURE FOR MEASURE the ribald scenes are irrelevant to the plot save in so far as Lucio's ribaldry pursues the Duke. Yet even in THE WIDOW'S TEARS the closing scene is eked out with stuff in the taste of the unsavoury conversations of our play, and in particular covers common ground with its scene ii, as if there had not been enough ribaldry already.

It is to be said for Chapman, indeed, that the ribald episodes are partly precedented in the old PROMOS AND CASSANDRA, where the supererogatory "realistic" scenes are so much more lifelike than those of the plot proper. Evidently such matter was felt to be necessary to the success of a serious play; and Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch even puts the opinion that in acting the play loses effect by dropping them—a somewhat severe impeachment of it as a whole. But the impeachment concerns the draftsman; and he, as we contend, was not Shakespeare, but presumably the draftsman of the similar scenes in PERICLES, which indeed are worse. To assign either set to Chapman is a course warranted by his use of similar elements in two of his comedies; and when we note that two terms, *sheep-biter* and *flesh-monger*, the latter occurring nowhere else in all Shakespeare, are used in that kind of connection in our play, and are used by Chapman in one signed play, we have further sound ground for our ascription of the ribald matter to him. The author of scene ii of Act II of THE WIDOW'S TEARS was second to none of his day in fitness for the undertaking.

Turning again to the general aspects of the play, both

of style and structure, we find pervading indications of Chapman's hand. The super-elaboration of the plot, to begin with, recalls the management of THE WIDOW'S TEARS, a play of two plots to start with, which yet has added to it a third plot-scheme in respect of the hunt for Lysander after he has been detected and flouted by Cynthia. These plays indicate the then growing movement of the stage towards an increasing complexity of plot, seen again in CYMBELINE and in A WINTER'S TALE. And in both our play and the WIDOW'S TEARS the involution is excessive. MEASURE FOR MEASURE is so spun-out by the Duke's methods of wire-pulling, retarding and engineering a public exposure of Angelo which is itself frustrated and stultified by the pardon, that at the close there is no room for a word from Juliet or Claudio, even as in THE WIDOW'S TEARS there is no room for a final appearance of Cynthia.

But the most convincing traces of Chapman are of course to be found in the style, where they are naturally to be looked for. In view of the fact that Shakespeare has more or less wrought over the whole, we shall certainly not find any such display of Chapman's manner as is yielded by one of his acknowledged plays; but there is verse-matter here, to say nothing of the prose, that is to be understood only as his, save for the kind of planing down that Shakespeare would have to give even to matter which he did not re-write. Take for instance this (IV, i, end):

> *Duke.* Now, gentle daughter, fear you not at all:
> He is your husband on a pre-contract:
> To bring you thus together 'tis no sin,
> Sith that the justice of your title to him
> Doth flourish the deceit. Come, let us go.
> Our corn's to reap, for yet our tilth's to sow;

and this (IV, iii, 75 sq.):—

> *Provost.* Here in this prison, father,
> There died this morning of a cruel fever
> One Ragozine, a most notorious pirate,
> A man of Claudio's years: his beard and head
> Just of his colour. What if we do omit
> This reprobate, till he were well inclined,
> And satisfy the deputy with the *visage*
> Of Ragozine, more like to Claudio?

Duke. O, 'tis an accident that heaven provides.
Dispatch it presently: the hour draws on
Prefixed by Angelo. *See this be done,*
And sent[1] according to command, whiles I
Persuade this rude wretch willingly to die.
Provost. This shall be done, good father, *presently.*
But Barnadine must die this afternoon;
And how shall we continue Claudio,
To save me from the danger that might come
If he were known alive?
Duke. Let this be done:
Put them in secret holds, both Barnardine
And Claudio.
Ere twice the sun hath made his journal greeting
To th' under generation, you shall find
Your safety manifested.

This is not Shakespearean verse, either in diction or in rhythm. It is not even good verse for Chapman: but Chapman's it is by the test of comparison with his hand-to-mouth work in his signed comedies. He *could* at times pen short verse-passages of well-diversified rhythm as well as of good diction; and at times his management of pausation recalls Shakespeare's; but he produced by the yard such verse as the following (MONSIEUR D'OLIVE, v), with monotonous double-endings in lines of end-stopped rhythm:

Vandome. See here, my lord, my honourable mistress
And her fair sister, whom your highness knows
Could never be importuned from their vows
By prayer or th' earnest suit of any friends,
Now hearing false report that your fair Duchess
Was dangerously sick, to visit her,
Did that which no friend else could win her to,
And broke her long-kept vow with her repair.
Philip. Madam, you do me an exceeding honour
In showing this true kindness to my Duchess,
Which she with all her kindness will requite.

When we turn from the general manner to the diction, our inference is strengthened. It happens that the phrase, "To th' under generation" is an emendation, the Folio reading "yonder"; but the emendation (by Hanmer) is almost universally accepted; and the misprint is satisfactorily explained by Grant White and Dr.

[1] Asyndeton, in the manner of Chapman.

W. W. Greg as a result of reading as "y" the contraction for "th." Now, "the under generation" is at it were a finger-print of Chapman,[1] who has "men of the under-globe," "*th' under*-dwellings," "these under regions," "in under continents," "the under earth,"[2] and yet other expressions of the kind; and who is on that as on the ground of vocabulary to be reckoned the writer of the phrase "this beneath world" in TIMON. To him, too, is to be assigned the slovenly repetition of "presently," a vocable which he heedlessly uses a hundred times, and of the Duke's injunctions.[3] In MAY-DAY (IV, ii), where we have "presently" four times in fifty lines, we have the repetition: "Ill shift me presently, Angelo," and "Now get you and shift you of this suit presently."

Surely not to Shakespeare, again, but to Chapman, is to be assigned in the same scene Isabella's wooden reception of the Duke's cruel announcement of her brother's death—a cruelty which he plans in the pleasing lines:

> The tongue of Isabel. She's come to know
> If yet her brother's pardon be come hither:
> But I will keep her ignorant of her good,
> To make her heavenly comforts[4] of despair

When she learns that

> His head is off and sent to Angelo,

her answer is—"Nay, but it is not so"; and when the exasperating Duke stolidly counsels patience we have this:—

> *Isabella.* O, I will to him and pluck out his eyes!
> *Duke.* You shall not be admitted to his sight.
> *Isabella.* Unhappy Claudio! wretched Isabel!
> Injurious world! most damned Angelo!

Thus does the maiden of the furious invective in the

[1] Though in Shakespeare's Sonnets (vii, 2) we have "under eye" with the same force.

[2] Refs. in SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN, pp. 155-6.

[3] The same word, freely used by both Marlowe and Greene, is notably frequent in THE TWO GENTLEMEN.

[4] Compare:—

> Why, this is *heavenly comfort* for thee, wife.

AN HUMOUROUS DAY'S MIRTH, Sc. 3.

prison scene receive the news of her brother's death by a hideous treachery. The series of critics, professional and other, who have protested against the invective, appear to have nothing to say on the ineptitude of the lines before us;[1] but it may fittingly be asked of any reader whether he can conceive of it as having been achieved by Shakespeare.

When, indeed, one finds Mr. Dover Wilson, with his good literary sense, declaring that he finds Pompey's prose in IV, i (with its name-coining for Mistress Overdone's customers) and the powerful but supererogatory Abhorson scenes which follow, all "undoubtedly Shakespeare's" save for a suspicion of revision set up (once more) by the verse scrap (ll. 55-56):

> O sir, you must; and therefore I beseech you
> Look forward on the journey you shall go,

one has misgivings about any consensus on what is and what is not Shakespeare matter; but one is still fain to press the point that Isabella's reception of the news of her brother's death is impossibly feeble for the Master, who might here, if he would, have given us of his lightning and tears of fire. Only a hopeless sense of the idle theatricality of the Duke's strategy could have stayed his hand. So abject is the handling, indeed, that it might fairly be asked whether it could have been penned by Chapman, who had certainly rhetoric enough for such occasions. On the hypothesis that there was an intermediate play between Whetstone's and ours, this matter might be a relic of that. The "I will to him and pluck out his eyes" is in fact a variant of a formula that occurs in the old TROUBLESOME RAIGNE OF KING JOHN and in the old LEIR, as well as in the Greenean TWO GENTLEMEN (IV, i, end) and the Marlovian COMEDY OF ERRORS (IV, iv, 107).[2] In PROMOS AND CASSANDRA the heroine receives the news of her brother's death thus:—

> Is my Andrugio done to death? fye. fye. O faithless trust;

[1] Grant White comments on the "pluck out his eyes" as revealing Isabella's shrewish temperament, but says nothing of the quality of the verse.

[2] Shakespeare has it in the DREAM (III, ii, 298). The tradition would make him employ it, with unwearying zest, in four plays.

and that limp exclamation may have been limply translated by another pre-Shakespearean as we have it in our play. But Cassandra follows up with a certain tragic dignity, and says to the messenger

> Lo, this is all: now give me leave to rue his loss alone,

which she does at conscientious length, in a rhetoric that might suggest to any fair workman an equivalent in blank-verse. The redundant plot-business in our play leaves no time for anything of the kind; and on any view Chapman (assuredly not Shakespeare, who could have "made good" in one line) must be credited with leaving us in his draft the anti-climax before us. The best that can be said for him is that the line in the same scene:

> One Ragozine, a most notorious pirate,

with its echo of "Bargulus, the strong Illyrian pirate" in 2 HENRY VI (IV, i, 108) and "Abradas, the great Macedonian pirate" in the First Part of the CONTENTION, lends some support to the surmise of an intermediate play, and invites the guess that, as Shakespeare left his draft untouched at this point, so Chapman had left a predecessor's. Only his "under generation" hints to us that he had been re-writing; for though the line:—

> Ere twice the sun hath made his journal greeting

savours of the archaic, the "under" is his specialty; and the line:

> By cold gradation and well-balanced form

is in his own style.

And whereas we can thus account for the feeble outcry of Isabella and other ineptitudes in the play as standing either for Chapman's hurry and flurry or for his acceptance of flaccid material given him by a previous adapter of PROMOS AND CASSANDRA, it is to be observed that no light is at this point shed for us by the theory of an incompetent re-writing of Shakespeare's work. We are dealing with poor verse, not a prose-scene of which it can be suggested that it is a re-writing of verse. The more reason for holding to a hypothesis of construction which accounts for such poor matter as draftsman's work that Shakespeare did not think it worth while to transmute.

In this case his abstention is hardly to his honour. Only boredom or pre-occupation can account for his letting pass such indigent diction where there came a chance for something infinitely better. If the boy who played Isabella could do justice to her pleadings for mercy, he could have delivered a moving speech over the frightful revelation of Angelo's wickedness in the slaying of her brother. The best we can suggest in exculpation is that, as the Duke's news was gratuitously false, Shakespeare did not think it worth while to meddle beyond trimming the verse into brevity and lucidity. Such a planing down, we have said, appears to have taken place even where there has been no re-writing. The style of Chapman, indeed, is much less turgid and tortuous in comedy than in tragedy; but in his sentimental comedy as in tragedy he is often prolix in verse, and Shakespeare would be sure to curtail him on that side, besides mending his worse obscurities. Therefore we are not to look, in a quasi-comedy drafted by him and revised by Shakespeare, for the full play of Chapman's idiosyncrasies. It is the more significant, then, if in this play we find not only an abundance of his special vocabulary but a number of his specialties of phrase.

In the opening scene, which I take to be a re-writing by Shakespeare of Chapman matter, there are several words which occur here only in the Concordance; and all of them are either actually used by Chapman, as *institutions* and *leavened*, or coinages markedly in his manner, such as *belongings* and *concernings*, which match his many participial nouns, *deservings*, *aspirings*, *blastings*, *parings*, *singings*, *purgings*, et cetera. But over and above these we may, I think, detect his draft in the lines :

> Mortality and mercy in Vienna
> Live in thy tongue and heart.

This, like the previous

> But I do *bend my speech*
> To one that can *my part in him advertise*;

savours of a verbal jugglery that is far more dear to Chapman than to Shakespeare. The word *mortality*, so often used by Chapman, is seen to have shifting meanings

as early as the First Part of HENRY VI, where, in the Talbot scenes, it means both mortality (the being mortal) and humanity (the being human), as well as death; and here it means death, the general sense of the phrase being "life and death." But we thus get the perverse formula: "Death lives in thy tongue," a Chapmanese and not a Shakespearean locution. Compare:

> You know that *death lives* where power lives unused.
> DE GUIANA: Poems, p. 51*a*.
>
> The last breath
> That kills the living, and regenerates death.
> BUSSY D'AMBOIS, v, i.

In view of that coincidence, there is the less ground for hesitating to infer an original draft by Chapman behind the opening scene when we compare:—

> Heaven doth with us as we with torches do. . . .
> Nature never lends
> The smallest scruple of her excellence. . . .

with Chapman's lines in BYRON'S CONSPIRACY (III, iii, 10-11):—

> The heavenly powers envy what they enjoin:
> We are commanded t' imitate their natures

—with their charmless utterance of the same thought. The parallelisms of idea do not end there. The most remembered touch of all:

> Spirits are not finely touched
> But to fine issues,

points curiously to certain lines in Chapman's Epistle Dedicatory to Prince Henry with his issue of the first Twelve Books of the Iliad:—

> O 'tis wondrous much
> Though nothing prized, that the right virtuous touch
> Of a well-written soul to virtue moves;
> Nor have we souls to purpose if their loves
> Of fitting objects be not so inflamed.

The volume is undated, and is held to be not earlier than 1609; so it is arguable that Chapman was echoing something he had heard in the theatre. But after his undisguised flurry of jealousy in the "Coronet for his Mistress Philosophy" (1595) over "Muses that Fame's loose feathers beautify"—with an evident squint at the VENUS

and the LUCRECE—he was little likely to echo a Shakespeare play; and the plain probability is that he was but repeating, as he so constantly did, one of his own moral sentiments, to which Shakespeare had given, at a touch, the gnomic quality at which Chapman was always aiming, and the supreme felicity of form that he never attained. There is always that irreducible difference between them —the difference between consummate genius and strenuous zeal.

Thus do we seem to find that even in a scene which Shakespeare has inlaid with some of his most perfect lines he is working over a Chapman draft. There is the more reason, then, to suspect that such a phrase as "the dribbling dart of love" (I, iii, 2) is a Chapmanism;[1] and to entertain the surmise that yet another speech upon which Shakespeare has set his stamp is not only a transmutation, but is at one point to be interpreted only through the vocabulary of Chapman. Claudio's phrase (III, i, 120):

> And the delighted spirit
> To bathe in fiery floods,

is explained by the latest editors, as by most others, by glossing "delighted" as="capable of delight." But though this reading would be satisfactory if the word were "delightful," it has no clear warrant in Elizabethan vocabulary as regards "delighted." And that term is capable of another interpretation. Daniel uses "delighting place" with the apparent force of "alighting place"; and Chapman in his version of the Homeridian Hymn TO DIANA, makes the Goddess

> A bashful virgin, and of fearful hearts
> The death-affecter, with *delighted darts*.

Here the word can mean only "loosed-off"; and we are led to understand "the delighted spirit" as "the spirit loosed from the body as an arrow from the bow."[2] That

[1] Compare his "mizzling breath of policy" (BYRON'S TRAGEDY, III, i, 132).

[2] I admit that Chapman's phrases, "odours most delighted," in OVID'S BANQUET OF SENSE (st. 7), and "we therefore must procure the sense delighted" (st. 64) suggest a possibility that "the delighted spirit" might be penned by him with a reminiscence of those turns of expression, and not in the special sense I have inferred. But in any case the term seems to be his. What Shakespeare has given is the verse-music, impossible to Chapman.

the speech of Claudio should have been a recast, however masterly, of one penned by Chapman, may seem to some Shakespeareans a repugnant proposition; but if for the obstinate delusion that Shakespeare possessed the largest English vocabulary they would substitute the recognition of his supreme mastery of that he used, they might see in it a new guidance to the right knowledge of his supremacy.

In the speech of the Duke to Claudio on death, again, we know that we are reading Shakespeare. Chapman never compassed such rhythm or such diction; he would have put a dozen or twenty double-endings where Shakespeare has but five to the thirty-seven lines; and yet here too we might infer, from the occasional flaws in the metre, that the speech is a reconstruction.[1] The line

> For, like the ass whose back with ingots bows,

may perhaps be reckoned proverbial, since in JULIUS CÆSAR (IV, i, 21) we have: "as the ass bears gold"—a passage rather difficult to date—but even on that view it suggests a connection with Chapman's

> Thou [Fortune] that lad'st
> Th' unworthy ass with gold

in THE WIDOW'S TEARS (I, i, 6-7); and we can easily conceive Chapman framing a long sententious and turgid allocution[2] on life and death, hardly a line of which would give us rhythmic pleasure. As has been pointed out in another connection, the *ideas* both here and in Claudio's speech seem to have been in large part suggested by Montaigne; and it may be that here Chapman was the intermediary in that respect. But what Shakespeare has given us is what Chapman could not give, a verse that turns all to harmony—the service he *could* do us in such a case.

In the third section of scene ii, again, where Shake-

[1] This holds, of the Duke's opening speech, I, i, with its crux in l. 8:—

> But that to your sufficiency, as your worth is able.

The passage seems to point to Chapman's version of the ILIAD, vi, 561: "Enough will is not *put* to thy ability."

[2] For good samples of his powers, see the speech of Strozza to his wife at the beginning of scene iii of Act IV of THE GENTLEMAN USHER; and the speeches of Byron at the beginning of Act III and end of Act V of BYRON'S TRAGEDY.

speare's re-casting hand is just as apparent, we have the line :

> The stealth of our *most mutual* entertainment,

where the infelicitous terms point to Chapman's tic of introducing the word *mutual* at every opportunity.[1]

Similarly the passage, II, i, 37-40 :

> Well, Heaven forgive him and forgive us all.
> Some rise by sin and some by virtue fall ;
> Some run from brakes of ice, and answer none,
> And some condemned by a fault alone,

will alike by the slack style, the sentiments, the slight rhyming, the sententiousness, and the asyndeton, strongly suggest Chapman to students; but they contain a further clue to him. Mr. Dover Wilson rightly retains "ice" as against the emendation "vice," but connects it with the "thick-ribbed ice" of III, i, 122. It points rather directly, however, to the passage :

> chain up thy blood
> In manacles of ice,

in the recently assigned CHARLEMAGNE,[2] II, ll. 543-4, and to Chapman's repeated metaphorical use of "brake" in his plays and poems (GENTLEMAN USHER, III, ii, 382; BUSSY D'AMBOIS, I, i, 87; BYRON'S TRAGEDY, IV, i, 84; Poems, pp. 80*b*, 150*a*). A brake, as understood by Chapman, is not exactly as Mr. Wilson explains, a kind of cage, but rather a kind of clamp.[3]

Equally, the "snow broth" of our play (I, iv, 58) points to "made my choler as cold as snow water" in CHARLEMAGNE, ll. 44-45, and to the further passage :—

> For snow and fire can hardly generate (l. 325).

[1] See THE PROBLEM OF THE "MERRY WIVES," p. 26.

[2] Otherwise THE DISTRESSED EMPEROR—a play which has been conclusively proved to be Chapman's by Professor Schoell of Chicago in his masterly edition (Oxford Univ. Press, 1920). I differ from Professor Schoell only over his view that the play is Chapman's first.

[3] For instances :—

> See in how grave a brake he sets his vizard
> (BYRON'S TRAGEDY, IV, i);
> Splint him together, set him in a brake
> Of form and reading (POEMS, p. 150*a*);

and this suits with "brakes of ice" in our play.

Another clue to him is the passage (IV, i, 59-60):—

> O place and greatness! millions of false *eyes*
> Are *stuck upon* thee,

which points to twenty phrases of the kind in his work.[1] Even the repeated pleonasm "quick celerity" (IV, ii, 113), "swift celerity" (v, 399), may be held to point to Chapman, not to Shakespeare. "Swift celerity," as it happens, occurs in Greene's SELIMUS, l. 528, and is thus one of the slight clues suggesting a Greene stratum in the play. But it was a kind of thing quite possible to Chapman, who provides us with such pleonasms as "impartial equity," "free voluntaries," "dumb silence," "moist wave" and "speedy readiness." Shakespeare's instinct for words seems to have guarded him from such transgression, where the scholarship of men of scholarly pretentions gave no safeguard.

And here again we find one of the clues embedded in inferior rhymed verse, stamped with heedless haste, and as unlike Shakespeare as it is like Chapman:—

> *Duke.* This is his pardon, purchased by such sin
> For which the pardoner himself is in.
> Hence has offence his quick celerity,
> When it is borne in high authority
> When vice makes mercy, mercy's so extended
> That for the fault's love is the offender friended.

A minor clue that is perhaps worth noting is the asyndeton in the passage I, iv, 72-75:

> *Isabella.* Doth he so seek his life?
> *Lucio.* Has censured him
> Already; and, as I hear, the provost hath
> A warrant for his execution;

which matches this in the GENTLEMAN USHER, v, i, 15-17,

> *Bassiolo.* Come, meet me boldly, come
> And let them come from hunting when they dare.
> *Vincentio.* Has the best spirit.

In IV, iii, again, after the blocks of Chapmanese prose dialogue, and the un-Shakespearean verse about Ragozine the "most notorious pirate," we come to the doubled "presently's" and the "heavenly comforts" (l. 109)

[1] See SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN, pp. 35-38.

which we have seen to duplicate his work, as the line (IV, iv, 2):

In most uneven and distracted manner

echoes his tune in the line:

In a most hideous and dreadful manner

in the MERRY WIVES,[1] which in turn points to his "most hideous cry" in THE GENTLEMAN USHER, V, i.

But without further resort to argument from minor parallelisms in plays in which Chapman is assumed to have elsewhere found entrance into the Folio, it remains to confirm the inference arising from so many clear clues to his signed work by a confrontation of those elements of vocabulary in MEASURE FOR MEASURE which are special to it. The words and compounds which occur only in this play in the Shakespeare Concordance number over 160, of which some may be set aside as of little significance. Such are:—

All-hallow's eve, bald-pate, bald-pated, China-dish, custom-shrunk, disguiser, facing (of robes), garden-house, hot-house, house-eaves, lamb-skins, piled (of cloth), pre-contract, ready-money, school-maids, stones (of fruit), tap-house, etc.—

words specially descriptive and not *likely* to be used again. Again, flections of words used in other plays should count for little when they appear once only. For instance, "denunciation"=annunciation or declaration, appears only in this play; but the verb "denounce" with that force appears in several, and that too is used by Chapman.

In some degree more significant are the eighteen words beginning in "un," and the four compounds of "well," as, "well-balanced." Many more such words occur only once in the Concordance, and still more once only in Chapman. So that though we find in him, of the once-used words of this play, "unbelieved," "unharmful," "untrussing," "unmask," "unhurtful," it is sounder to argue merely that all these eighteen formations, being very much in his manner, are confirmatory of a claim

[1] IV, iv, 34. See "MERRY WIVES," p. 20; and note the octo-syllabics in that play.

more strongly founded, than to dwell upon such instances. The strength of the argument from vocabulary to the inference of his presence lies mainly in the occurrence here, once only in all the plays, of a number of words not "required," and therefore potentially significant when found in a dubious work ascribed to another author.

Such words are:—Adoptedly, advisings (sb.), attorneyed, austereness, aves, bawd-born, belocked, belongings, billets (of wood), carnally, characts, clap-dish, circummured, combinate, concernings, concupiscible, confixed, definitive, denunciation (=annunciation), disvalued, disvouched, doubleness, dribbling, dukes (verb), enew, enshield (? enshelled), ensky'd, fewness, flesh-monger, fore-named, forted, gnarled, gratulate (adj.), helmed (=steered), immoderate, inequality (=improbability), infliction, informal, ingots, instate, institutions, inward (sb.), leaven'd, meal'd, misreport, moated, morality, nicety, notedly, offenceful, outward-sainted, over-read, paralleled, perdurably, permissive, planched, plausible, pose (vb.), prolixious, prompture, propagation (of a dower), razure, rebate, refelled, remissness, remonstrance (=demonstration), renouncement, reproach (vb.), reprobate (sb.), scaled (=weighed? or laid bare?), seedness, seemers, self-offences, sheep-biting, sicels (=shekels), shy (twice), siege (=seat), sisterly, sliding (sb.), snow-broth, spawned, splay (vb.), starkly, stifle (intrans.), straitness, stricture (=strictness), sunrise, temporary (=temporal?), tested, testimonied, thick-ribbed, tongue (vb.), touse, treasonable, vastidity, viewless, vulgarly (=publicly), warranted, wholesom'st, whoremonger.

These hundred words, I think, are a fair selection from the 165 or more once-used words to be found in the play. Some of them (as 'thick-ribbed') occur in plainly Shakespearean passages; many others are not to be found in Chapman's known work so far as I have noted; but so many are to be found in his signed or assigned works, and so many more are markedly in his manner, that, seeing he too uses many hundreds of words once only, there is almost an equal presumption as between his draftsmanship and Shakespeare's, even when the

untraced words occur in passages that as they stand are quite Shakespearean. Let us first note words in the list which actually occur in his works :—

Billets (IV, iii, 58). Used in BUSSY D'AMBOIS, III, ii, 38.

Combinate (III, i, 231). Appears to=combined in a sense found in Chapman (*e.g.* "combined bed" in 11th Odyssey, 309).

Concupiscible (V, i, 98). As Shakespeare never uses even the noun "concupiscence," and Chapman does use it, this very awkward adjective may be credited to him.

Denunciation (=annunciation, I, ii, 152). Verb so used in the Poems, p. 274*b*, and elsewhere.

Dribbling. See above, p. 195.

Fleshmonger (V, i, 337). Used with the same force in MAY-DAY, III, iii, 38.

Gratulate (adj. V, i, 535). Even the verb is not of Shakespeare's using where it occurs in the Folio, common as it was on the stage. Chapman uses it often.

Infliction (I, iii, 28). Used in introd. to Odyssey; and Od., i, 4; also in the REVENGE OF BUSSY, V, i, 8.

Informal (V, i, 236). Used in BYRON'S TRAGEDY, IV, ii, 39.

Ingots (III, i, 26). See above, p. 196. I do not recall the word in Chapman; but he would find "gold ingots" in Marlowe's part of HERO AND LEANDER, i, 172. And he has "golden faggots," BUSSY D'AMBOIS, II, ii, 104.

Institutions (I, i, 11). In Poems, p. 97*a*., etc.

Inward (sb. III, ii, 138=an intimate). Chapman very many times uses the word, sometimes as a noun in the plural, and twice as an adjective (HYMN TO CHRIST: Poems, pp. 146*b*, 147*a*) with the force of "intimate." The noun here, then, is probably his, as is the character speaking.

Leavened (I, i, 52). Used in the Poems: p. 151*b*.

Morality (I, ii, 138). In THE GENTLEMAN USHER, II, i, 274. (It is noteworthy that in both our play and the USHER the word is used with the same slight force of "order" or "control." The word had not then any serious vogue; and Shakespeare never uses "immorality" either.)

Nicety (II, iv, 162). Also in THE GENTLEMAN USHER, II, i, 276; also in THE WIDOW'S TEARS, II, iii, 178.

Offenceful (II, iii, 26). In MAY-DAY, IV, ii, 99.

Paralleled (IV, ii, 82). "Parallel" is used as a verb ("paralleling") in the Poems, p. 183*a*.

Passes (V, i, 375) points to "amorous pass" in the 15th Odyssey, l. 559.

Pick-lock (III, ii, 18). Twice in a scene of the USHER, IV, iii, 15, 53.

Planchèd (=planked: IV, i, 30). As Chapman has both "plank" ("doors of plank," 2nd Odyssey, l. 39) and "planky" (12th Iliad, 442) the word is likely to be his.

Plausible (III, i, 253). Used in pref. "To the Understander," trans. of Homer.

Pose (verb: II, iv, 51). Used in MAY DAY, II, 568.

Rebate (I, iv, 60). Verb used in THE REVENGE OF BUSSY, III, ii, 18.

Refelled (v, i, 94). Used in Odyssey trans., xxi, 120; Iliad, ix, 36.

Remissness (II, ii, 96). Chapman has "remissly" in his first version of the 2nd Iliad (Shepherd's ed., p. 550*a*).

Remonstrance (=demonstration: v, i, 397). Chapman so uses the verb "remonstrate" in BYRON'S CONSPIRACY, IV, i, 132.

Reproach (vb. v, i, 426). Used in CHARLEMAGNE, v, iii, 231.

Sheep-biting (v, i, 359). "Sheepbiters" (which occurs in TWELFTH NIGHT, II, v, 6) is used in this sense in MAY DAY, III, i, 242.

Snow-broth. See above, p. 197.

Spawned (III, ii, 115). Chapman has the noun, CÆSAR AND POMPEY, II, i, 45, and elsewhere. In the Folio it occurs only in CORIOLANUS.

Splay (II, i, 243). Used in Comm. on B. xix of ILIAD.

Starkly (IV, ii, 70). Chapman so often uses "stark" that this may safely be assigned to him. The idea is in his manner.

Stifle (II, iv, 158, vb. intrans.). So used in CÆSAR AND POMPEY, I, i, 22.

Straitness (III, ii, 269). Occurs in REVENGE OF BUSSY, IV, iii, 63.

Sun-rise (II, ii, 153). Used in 16th Odyssey, l. 30.

Touse (v, i, 313). Used in CHARLEMAGNE, I, l. 576.

Vulgarly (=publicly: v, i, 160). Occurs in BYRON'S CONSPIRACY, III, ii, 233.

Wholesom'st (IV, ii, 76). This word, followed by "spirits," almost calls Chapman's name. Compare "solid'st stone" in 19th Odys., l. 679.

To these once-used words it may be worth while to add mention of a few which occur in other plays, but are still open to suspicion as of Chapman derivation:—

(1) One is "approof" (II, iv, 175), found twice in ALL'S WELL and once in ANTONY. It is thus a word of Shakespeare's late period, and it always strikes me as probably of Chapman's introduction, like "apperil" in TIMON. In the same speech in which Isabella uses (2) "approof" occurs "prompture," an eminently Chapman-like formation.

(3) So with "vaporous" (IV, i, 58), which elsewhere appears only in MACBETH (III, v, 24) in one of the (to me) obviously un-Shakespearean sets of octosyllabics—one

delivered by Hecate, after two lines of blank-verse. This is a Chapman word, occurring in THE SHADOW OF NIGHT (Poems, p. 14*a*) and in the translation of the ILIAD (xxiii, 90).

(4) "Advertise," too, occurring only here (I, i, 41; v. 379) and in HENRY VIII, is also a Chapman word, occurring in his version of the ILIAD (xxiv, 144) and in BYRON'S TRAGEDY (v, i, 14); and I suspect that (5) "propagation" (I, ii, 146), which has been challenged by editors as a misprint, is a Chapmanism, having regard to his various peculiar uses of that noun and verb.[1]

(6) "Sciatica," again, occurs only here (I, ii, 59) and in kindred Chapmanese passages in TROILUS (v, i, 25) and an adapted one in TIMON (IV, i, 23); and this is found in Chapman, WIDOW'S TEARS, II, iii, 22. (7) The kindred term "serpigo" (spelt "sapego" in the Folio, III, i, 31), and found only here and in TROILUS (II, iii, 81), again points to Chapman, who has a character Sarpego in the GENTLEMAN USHER.

(8) "Glassy" is found only in this play (II, ii, 120) and in HAMLET and 1 HENRY VI (v, iii, 62), where it is used literally. In figurative senses, as here, it is frequent in Chapman (Poems, p. 8*b*; BUSSY D'AMBOIS, I, i, 29; CHARLEMAGNE, IV, iii, 45).

(9) "Gradation," occurring only here (IV, iii, 104) and in OTHELLO (I, i, 37) is found in Chapman, BUSSY D'AMBOIS, III, ii, 77.

(10) "Audible" (v, i, 413), found only here and in a non-Shakespearean passage in CORIOLANUS (IV, v, 238) is used by Chapman in SIR GILES GOOSECAP, v, i, 118.

With regard, finally, to a large number of the words not here traced, it will probably be admitted that they are more likely to be Chapman's than Shakespeare's. "Austereness" I have not noted in his signed work, though "austere" and "austerity" come very often; but when we find him using both "niceness" and "nicety," "obscureness" and "obscurity," "secureness" and "security," "pureness" and "purity," the formation is seen to be presumptively his, like "stricture" for

[1] See SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN, p. 157.

"strictness." "Advisings" and "concernings" are in the manner of dozens of his nonce-formations, as is "attorneyed" (compare his "uncle'd," "person'd," "author'd," "heir'd"); and "leaven'd" and "meal'd" are of the same order. "Seedness" and "doubleness," again, strongly suggest him, especially the former, which points to his adjective "seedy." "Bawd-born" at once connects with his "town-born," "sea-born," "heaven-born," and other such combinations; "belocked" recalls his "besmooth" and "belabouring" (= labouring); and "confixed" his four times used "infixed," and his "transfixed." Even "unwedgeable" suggests his drafting; and "whoremonger" is eminently likely to be his word (compare "fleshmonger"). When we find him using both "unskilful" and "skilfully," we may reasonably assign to him "unskilfully." The "well"-compounds, as "well-balanced," might be anybody's; but he has many such. "Testimonied" is specially like him.

More definitely is he suggested by "a very superficial, ignorant, unweighing fellow" (III, ii, 147), seeing that in the WIDOW'S TEARS (II, ii, 6) we have: "that bold ass that never weighs what he does or says." And, subconscious as I am of having seen in his work a number of these words which I have not retraced, I should not be surprised if many such were found by readers with better verbal memory than mine.

VIII. VERSIFICATION

Such a body of vocabulary clues, reinforcing the argument from plot construction and from a number of specialties of phrase and sentiment, seems to constitute so strong a basis for the Chapman hypothesis that only a stronger cumulative body of evidence for another hand could overrule the inference. In the absence of that, the ascription of the drafting of the play to Shakespeare can be maintained only by way of blank refusal to accept any evidence against the canonical ascription, in defiance even of the body of critical opinion which pronounces

much of the prose of the play spurious. It remains, then, to urge against such acceptance of tradition the very strong general presumption against Shakespeare's authorship that is set up by the versification of much of the play.

As before observed, the revision by Shakespeare has gone so far—and this, *ex hypothesi*, by reason of his practical perception of the obscurity and dramatic ineffectiveness of Chapman's declamation in general—that we do not find that declamation to anything like the extent to which it signalises an unadapted Chapman play. But neither do we find in it, as a whole, the versification of Shakespeare; and the solution of a revision by him of Chapman's work will be found to be the only one that meets the case.

In the opening scene, in which the vocabulary and other clues point to Chapman, we yet have a versification, a freely varying pausation, that is as distinctly Shakespeare's as that of the scene between the Duke and Claudio. And this holds throughout the Act, though a series of verbal clues continues to tell of a substratum by another hand. He has put forth his strength again in the most vital scenes of the second Act, in the moving pleadings of Isabella and the parries of Angelo: here the rhythm is one with the emotion, though verbal clues still tell of a primary text re-written. And so with the unmatched speeches of the Duke and Claudio on death in Act III, where, still in a re-writing of matter well lost, we have a tragic music that he does not often surpass. If, however, we turn now to Act V, we are at once faced by a versification of a different kind, a movement relatively monotonous, a rhythm normally line-ended, and this with a percentage of double-endings telling of a hand much given to that form. For the entire Act the percentage is over 30, whereas the rate for the play as a whole is only 26. But the definitely significant thing is the versification. Thus the Act begins :—

Duke. My very worthy cousin, fairly met!
Our old and worthy friend, we are glad to see you.
Ang. Happy return be to your royal grace!
Duke. Many and hearty thankings to you both.

And this measure, this tune, prevails throughout the Act. With the entrance of Friar Peter we have a long run of such lines; and though the speeches of Isabella frequently show clear marks of another hand with a subtler rhythm, they, too, often fall into the monotonous tune, as here :—

> In brief, to set the needless process by,
> How I persuaded, how I prayed, and kneel'd,
> How he rebelled me, and how I replied—
> For this was of much length—the vile conclusion
> I now begin with grief and shame to utter;

the double-endings setting up a maximum effect of monotony because the rhythm always stresses them. This, as before contended, is not Shakespeare's way of writing blank-verse in his maturity. Before 1604 he had written the soliloquy :

> How all occasions do inform against me,

with its endlessly varying pulsation, and with but five double-endings to 64 lines of blank verse. And in TWELFTH NIGHT, where he seems to have worked over, about this period, the whole of his foundation play, and where in one speech (IV, iii, 1-21) we have seven double-endings to 21 lines, the rhythm yet remains so varied that there is no monotony. But let us compare the bulk of the verse of the last Act of our play with those speeches in the earlier Acts which are so unmistakably his, and note the contrast.

> *Claudio.* Ay, but to die and go we know not where,
> To lie in cold obstruction, and to rot;
> This sensible warm motion to become
> A kneaded clod; and the delighted spirit
> To bathe in fiery floods, or to reside
> In thrilling regions of thick-ribbèd ice;
> To be imprisoned in the viewless winds,
> And blown with restless violence round about
> The pendent world!

Here the thrill of the verse doubles the thrill of the imagery: and there is but one double-ending in the speech. Chapman never wrote thus; but if we take any serious play of his and curtail its turgidly exuberant speeches to practicable lengths, leaving the remaining versification, as far as it is legible, untouched, we shall get just such

strings of lines in one tune, made doubly marked by the double-endings, as constitute the bulk of Act v of MEASURE FOR MEASURE, and much of the rest. And if anyone will critically compare, say, the style of the prose in Act III, ribald and decent alike, with that of the plays of Chapman already sampled for similar matter, he will find the same characters; even as he will find parallels to the already noted octosyllabics at the close. Shakespeare has but transfigured the Act in its great passages: the rest is the hardly modified work of the other.

In the fourth Act, after the lovely song—which is verily not Chapman's[1]—we have again the un-Shakespearean hand. The transitions from blank verse to couplets, and from couplets to prose, are in Chapman's manner, though the marks of curtailment are constant; and Isabella's speech:

> He hath a garden *circummur'd* with brick,

trimmed to lucidity and brevity, is in the monotonous tune. So with the Duke's:

> Nor, gentle daughter, fear you not at all,

which continues in that tune, even as its purport belongs to the peculiar kind of sentiment that makes the Friar in BUSSY D'AMBOIS overrule the scruples of Tamyra. The Duke-Friar, persuading Isabella and Mariana alike, is of Chapman's conception. So with the rapid prose, keeping up a speed of action that at least holds the stage interest, and is maintained in the verse, in which we have found so many direct clues to Chapman. Hardly ever does the rhythm become truly Shakespearean: for even in Angelo's soliloquy:—

> This deed unshapes me quite, makes me unpregnant
> And dull to all proceedings

[1] That Fletcher, good lyrist as he is, can have written this stanza, as he presumably wrote the companion stanza in THE BLOODY BROTHER, is hard to believe. That it is worthy of Shakespeare, no one ever doubted. But the solution that this song is from a woman to a man, while the second stanza is from a man to a woman, is not quite convincing though it is plausible. "Those eyes, the break of day, Lights that do mislead the morn," is after all more germane to a man's than to a woman's passion; and the song hardly fits the case of Mariana and Angelo. Besides, Mariana says to the page, "Break off thy song," as if it were not finished. Still, none of us will consent to take *this* from Shakespeare without strong reason.

—where Shakespeare has given pregnancy to the matter, there is no free flow of his verse: he is but employing his revising stage-craft to the end of securing a good stage effect. Nor can it have been Shakespeare who penned the poor lines (v, i, 415-16):—

> Haste still pays haste, and leisure answers leisure;
> Like doth quit like—and MEASURE still FOR MEASURE—

the formal justification of the title of the play, which is never really justified at all.

IX. SUMMARY

Here, then, a "naturalistic" study of a perplexing text once more yields a perfectly intelligible solution. All the anomalies of our play, which have perplexed so many critics and repelled so many readers, explain themselves when we realise it as but a working re-cast by Shakespeare of a play drafted by Chapman on the basis of the older play of Whetstone, or perhaps of an earlier condensation of that two-part drama into a single one. The repulsive and contradictory ethic, so wounding to right feeling, is just what Chapman so often yields us. The figure of Lucio, which flouts that of the Duke, is entirely in the manner of the limner of Lemot, Monsieur d'Olive, and others of that order, and, we may add, of Parolles in ALL'S WELL; and the Friar-Duke who lies to Claudio and makes assignations for the two women in this drama is conceived by the creator of the still more accommodating Friar in BUSSY D'AMBOIS, who makes them for a married woman.

The prose scenes, some of which an able editor would fain account for as substitutions, made with the consent of either Shakespeare or his company, for scenes in Shakespearean verse, are equally traceable to Chapman as draftsman; and the mingling of scraps of verse with prose, like the mixtures of blank and rhyme, are absolutely matchable from his practice. Shakespeare has re-written a quantity of the verse: he has not re-written

the prose, simply because for the purposes of the stage it did not need re-writing, where Chapman's verse infallibly would. "The two halves of this scene," writes Sir A. Quiller-Couch of the first scene of Act III, "cannot be made of a piece by anyone possessing even a rudimentary acquaintance with English prose and poetry. We will not say that they could not have been written—an interval granted—by the same man. But we say confidently that the two parts could not have been written by the same man at one spell, on one inspiration, or with anything like an identical or even continuous poetic practice." Precisely so, and they were not so written. But the causation becomes clear only when we realise that the poetry of the verse section is in itself a re-writing in which the first hand has not been wholly eliminated at the close; just as at the close of the previous scene the rapid re-writing of Isabella's verse leaves us with the poor finish:

> Then Isabel live chaste, and brother die:
> "More than our brother is our chastity."
> I'll tell him yet of Angelo's request,
> And fit his mind to death, for his soul's rest.

There the hand and the voice are alike Chapman's.

And so with the close of the drama. The process by which the Duke "tails off into a stage puppet and ends a wearisome man, talking rubbish," and the intensive strain of the whole ends in "a forced and galvanised stage-grin," with Lucio in the limelight, is entirely in the manner of Chapman comedy. Hallam, suspecting no other hand, pronounced that the marriage of the Duke and Isabella is "one of Shakespeare's hasty half-thoughts." It was one of Chapman's plot-plans. But equally Chapmanesque, after all, is the Pompey and Elbow business which the critic finds "so obviously Dogberry-like and Shakespearean." Chapman, when all is said, was not a mere failure in his day: his comedies had drawing-power, and his knack of handling matter of this kind is marked; indeed it may be said to be at its cleverest where it is most offensive. That Shakespeare took joy in framing poor malapropisms for Elbow and

Pompey after the method had been exploited in MUCH ADO, some of us must take leave to doubt. That he hoped to save the play, of which he knew the fundamental failure, by such matter, is on the face of it improbable. Leaving as he did the other prose scenes to Chapman, he might very well leave these. If he really was minded to mend the play with this matter he has achieved little. Chapman, under the hard economic compulsion, common to so many play-makers, strove to win audiences for comedy with the kind of matter which audiences patronised. Shakespeare was so far interested in MEASURE FOR MEASURE as to lift into poetry much of the serious verse dialogue, patiently or impatiently transmuting material which he knew to be more or less hopeless—for such is Chapman's turgid tragic-didactic dialogue in the mass. But one does not easily conceive him in this mood, in his maturity, eking out an incurably unsatisfactory plot with "realistic" matter in every way inferior to what he had produced in HENRY IV. Well may he have been thinking of himself when he wrote in the opening scene:

> Spirits are not finely touched
> But to fine issues.

There are no fine issues here; unless indeed we so value for ourselves those touches of his hand which still keep men turning to "this most inconsistent drama." But it is surely no bad issue for criticism to attain to a reasoned and validated theory of the constructive process which ended in the putting of Shakespeare's name to MEASURE FOR MEASURE as sole author.

And if there remains in any student a sense of disappointment over the conclusion that the finest speeches in the play are but recasts of another man's work, let him ask himself whether that is really a ground for disappointment; whether in such a case disillusion is not a transition from a doubtful reverence to a newly illuminated admiration. How many readers have ever faced the fact that the greatest of all the strains of Shakespeare's music, the transcendent lines of Prospero on "the fabric of this vision," near the close of the TEMPEST, are indisputably a distillation of a whole succession of poetic exercises on

that topic and that series of thoughts, from Spenser to the Earl of Stirling?[1] Is there, to a sane judgment, any loss of either wonderment or delight when we recognise the alchemy of the process there? And, if not, why here? Some of us, at least, are content to say that for us the real Shakespeare, the man of the theatre who for the most part of his time was content to transfigure, much or little, the faulty performances of other men, laying on them his "skyey influences," inlaying their webs with his thread of gold, lifting their often halting verse and broken music at times to the utmost altitudes of song, is not only more wonderful because newly wonderful, but more admirable because newly understood. Chapman, we know, held that poetic merit lay in novelty of tale, style, stanza, theme and topic. But Chapman was wrong, by the test of three hundred years of disregard.

[1] See MONTAIGNE AND SHAKESPEARE, 2nd ed., pp. 226-8.

INDEX

A

Acheson, A., on KING JOHN, 73, *n*; on the Talbot scenes, 83
Actors and blank verse, 140
ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL, 42, 172, 173, 177
ALPHONSUS EMPEROR OF GERMANY, 119 sq.
American research, vii sq.
Angelo, character of, 159 sq.
ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA, 47, 164
Antony's oration, xviii, 132
ARDEN OF FEVERSHAM, 147 sq.

B

Baconics, 21, 131
Beaumont, xvii, sq.
Belletristic criticism, viii sq.
Blackstone, on the COMEDY OF ERRORS, 2; on THE TWO GENTLEMEN, 5.
Blank verse, the resort to, 140
Bond, Prof. Warwick, on THE TWO GENTLEMEN, 4, 5 *n.*, 9; on double-endings, 11 *n.*
Bradley, Dr. A. C., ix; on Shakespeare's attitude to dogs, 44; on RICHARD II, 47 sq.
Brandl, Prof., viii
Briggs, Dr. W. D., 111, 123
Brooke, Stopford, on MEASURE FOR MEASURE, 167, 172 *n.*
Browning, 10

C

Camden, 66
Carlyle, style of, 116 *n.*
Chambers, E. K., on MEASURE FOR MEASURE, 161, 162
Chapman, apparent clues to, in the ERRORS, 146 sq.; clues to, in MEASURE FOR MEASURE, 165, 172 sq., 177 sq., 186 sq.; salacity of, 165, 174, 186 sq.; anti-Puritanism of, 174; character-drawing of, 174 sq., 208; use of prose and verse by, 177 sq.; style of, 177 sq., 188 sq., 193 sq.; versification of, 189, 204 sq., 209; jealous of Shakespeare, 194; success of, in comedy, 209; his æsthetic false, 211.
CHARLEMAGNE, 197 *n.*
Chettle, cited, 41, 84 sq., 87; productivity of, 124
Chinese pottery, x
Chronology of the plays, 4, 13, 15, 17, 52, 130, 166
Cinthio, 159, 172
Clark and Wright, 61, 66, 100
Coleridge, on RICHARD II, 48; on THE COMEDY OF ERRORS, 130; on MEASURE FOR MEASURE, 158, 168, 169
Collins, Prof. Churton, 18 *n.*
COMEDY OF ERRORS, THE, xi, 2, 3, 13, 15, 126 sq.; double-endings in, 129, 131; character of, 130; versification of, 130 sq., 134, 143 sq., 155, 156; chronology of, 131, 157; "legalism" in, 157; Marlowe's authorship of, xi, 134 sq.
Comic relief, 10, 26, 27, 158
Croce, on TITUS, ix
Cunningham, H., 149
CYMBELINE, xii, 164

D

Daniel, 18, 19, 75 sq.
DAVID AND BETHSABE, 119 sq.
Double-endings, 7, 11, 16 sq., 129, 131 sq., 145; Greene's, 24 sq.; evolution of, 24 sq.; in RICHARD II, 52, 65, 73; in 1 HENRY VI, 89; in the COMEDY OF ERRORS, 129; in Antony's oration, 132
Duplicate scenes, 53 *n.*, 64, 109
Dyce, on THE TWO GENTLEMEN, 4; on Marlowe's translations, 94.

E

Economics of Elizabethan drama, 124
EDWARD I, 56, 81, 119
EDWARD II, 25, 48, 78, 152
EDWARD III, 22 *n.*, 24, 32, 59, 90, 111, 153
Elze, on the COMEDY OF ERRORS, 156
Ervine, Mr. St. John, 116 *n.*
Essex Conspiracy, the, 45 sq., 66 sq.

F

FAMOUS VICTORIES OF HENRY V, THE, 71
Farmer, 2, 66

Faustus, 24, 122
Fleay, F. G., on The Two Gentlemen, 4 sq.; his counts of double-endings, 11 *n.*; on chronology of Sh. plays, 13; on "young Juvenal"; on Richard II, x, 46; on the Comedy of Errors, 128; on The Taming of A Shrew, 135 sq.; on Titus, 136; on tests of authorship, 136; on Pericles, 186
Fletcher, 207 *n.*
Folio, the, editing of, xiii sq.
Forman, Dr. Simon, 70
Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, 20, 24
Furnivall, 33; on versification tests, 129; on dates of early plays, 130; on Measure for Measure, 161 *n.*

G

Genius, evolution of, 106
George-a-Greene, 24
German research, viii
Gnomai, 2, 28 sq.
Gollancz, Sir I., on The Two Gentlemen, 4, 27
Greene, Robert, presumptive author of The Two Gentlemen, 8 sq.; imitations of Lilly by, 9, 28, 29 *n.*, 30 *n.*; comic relief in, 10, 26; versification of, 22 sq., 77 sq., 118, 134; phraseology of, 28 sq., 35, 83; hostility of, to Shakespeare, 22, 115 sq.; works of, 24; clues to in Two Gentlemen, 26 sq.; gifts of, 27; style of, 28, 77; productivity of, 41 sq.; influence of, 77 sq.; repetitiveness of, 107; productivity of, 124, 173; in Edward III, 153; possible presence of, in Measure for Measure, 173; in All's Well, 173
Greg, Dr. W. W., 24 *n.*

H

Hales, Prof., 46
Hallam, on Measure for Measure, 167, 170 sq.
Halliwell-Phillips on The Two Gentlemen, 4 sq.; on anonymous Richard II play, 72
Hamlet, xii, 158, 169
Hanmer, 1 sq., 189
Hannibal, play on, 122, 124
Hart, H. C., 83 *n.*, 184
Heminge and Condell, xiii sq.
Henry IV, Part I, 11, 18, 25
Henry VI plays, 2, 11, 21, 25, 83
Henry VIII, 21, 128
Herford, Prof., ix
Hero plays, 122
Heywood, 87 *n.*; 116 *n.*
Hookham, G., 131 sq.
Hunter, J., on Measure for Measure, 169

I

Imitation Theory, the, 10, 15, 20, 22 sq., 33, 35, 41, 104 sq., 109 sq., 112, 114 sq., 116, 117, 145, 148
Ingram, J. H., 122 *n.*
Ingram, J. K., 128
Isabella, character of, 161 sq.

J

Jack Straw, 8, 70, 71
James IV, 20, 23, 26 sq.
Jew of Malta, The, 122
Jigging verse, 49, 92
John, Ivor B., on Richard II, 50 sq., 68 sq., 114
John, King, xi, 11, 18, 46 sq., 50, 65, 117
—— the old, xviii *n.*, 46, 50, 79, 87, 88 sq.
Johnson, Dr., on The Two Gentlemen, 2, 28; on versification, 7; on Richard II, 45; on Measure for Measure, 168 *n.*
Jonson, Ben, and the editing of the Folio, xiv sq.
Julius Cæsar, ix, xv sq., 52 sq.

K

Keller, Dr. W., 72
Kerrl, Dr. Anna, viii
Knight, Charles, on The Two Gentlemen, 3; on Measure for Measure, 168 sq.
König, counts of double-endings by, 11 *n.*
Kyd, versification of, 25 sq., 77, 89, 142, 143; in Richard III, 116 *n.*; and the old Shrew play, 135, 142, 143; in Edward III, 111; copies Marlowe in Arden, 147 sq.

L

Launce, character of, 6, 26, 43 sq.
Lear, 4
Lennox, Mrs. Charlotte, 4, 161 *n.*, 170, 175 *n.*
Lilly, 4, 9, 28, 29 *n.*, 30 *n.*
Lodge, 18, 19, 43, 118
Lounsbury, Prof., cited, 124
Love's Labour's Lost, 1, 4, 11, 13, 16, 19, 40
Lucrece, The Rape of, 18, 19

M

Mackail, J. W., cited, 18, 47 sq., 117
Malone, on THE TWO GENTLEMEN, 2 sq.; on TITUS, 3; on RICHARD II, 45 sq., 66 sq., 68; on THE COMEDY OF ERRORS, 3, 126 sq.; on THE TAMING OF A SHREW, 135 *n.*
MANFRED, 133 *n.*
Marlowe, style of, reflected in LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST, 19; double-endings in, 24 sq., 145; presence of, in RICHARD III, 20; in HENRY VI plays, 20, 50, 51, 92; versification of, 22, 25 sq., 89 sq., 105, 118, 134, 141, 143 sq., 156; "influence" of, in RICHARD II, x, 48, 50, 72, 112; attitude of, to rhyme in drama, 49, 92; repetitions in work of, 57, 107 sq.; in EDWARD III, 59, 90, 111; clues to, in RICHARD II, 60, 73 sq., 83 sq., 87 sq., 95 sq., 102 sq., 111 sq.; youthful work of, 89, 94; translations by, 94 sq.; imitation of, 107, 119, 137, 142; self-imitation by, 107 sq.; in RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, 92, 118; general influence of, xi, 118, 125; in ALPHONSUS EMPEROR OF GERMANY, 119 sq.; evolution of, 122 sq.; unassigned plays of, 122, 124 sq.; income of, 124; power of, 125; resort to comedy by, 134 sq.; in THE TAMING OF A SHREW, 135 sq.; in THE COMEDY OF ERRORS, 143 sq., 149 sq.; relations of, with Kyd, 149
MASSACRE AT PARIS, THE, 119, 121
MEASURE FOR MEASURE, problem of, 158 sq.; flaws of, 158 sq.; characterization in, 159 sq., 174 sq.; un-Shakespearean elements in, 162 sq., 172 sq., 186 sq., 204 sq.; prose and verse in, 164 sq., 177 sq.; clues to Chapman in, 165, 172 sq., 177 sq., 186 sq.; construction of, 166, 172 sq., 188; management of time in, 170 sq.; versification of, 188 sq., 204 sq.
MERCHANT OF VENICE, THE, 46
Meres, 21, 139
MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM, A, double-endings in, 11; versification of, 12 sq., 17, 133
Money values, Elizabethan, 124
Montaigne, 196
Montemayor, 5
MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING, 27, 42
Munday and Chettle, 84 sq.

N

Nashe, cited, 41; probable draftsman of Launce, 43 sq.; was Greene's "Young Juvenal," 43; on dogs, 44; humour of, 44; on the Talbot scenes, 87, 93; on Greene, 43
Newbolt, Sir H., on RICHARD II, 50, 52, 63, 77

O

Oliphant, E. H. C., 24 *n.*

P

PANDOSTO, 27
Parrott, Prof., 178
Pater, on MEASURE FOR MEASURE, 162 *n.*
Peele, and Greene, 8 sq.; style of, 56, 118; and Marlowe, 56, 87, 113, 118, 119; traces of, in RICHARD II, 57 sq., 71, 72, 82, 113, 118, 121; signs of, in anon. RICHARD II play, 72; verse of, 77, 81 sq., 89, 118, 119 sq.; repetitiveness of, 107; in RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, 118
Pellissier, G., xii sq.
Pembroke company, Shakespeare and, 21, 135
PERICLES, 165, 184, 186
Phrasal clues, 29 sq., 32 sq., 59 sq., 82 sq., 92 sq., 95 sq., 102 sq., 149 sq., 193 sq.
Pollard, A. W., on the editing of the Folio, xiii, xv
Pope, on THE TWO GENTLEMEN, 12, 28; on RICHARD II, 45 *n.*, 66
PROMOS AND CASSANDRA, 159 sq., 166 sq., 172, 187
Proteus, character of, 26 sq.

Q

Quiller-Couch, Sir A., on THE TWO GENTLEMEN, 5; on MEASURE FOR MEASURE, 161 sq., 163 sq., 167, 187

R

Raleigh, Prof. Sir W., 138 sq.
Repetition, in Elizabethan drama, 107-9
Rhodes, Compton, xv
Rhyme in drama, 49, 77 sq.
RICHARD II, x sq., xvii, 11; Ritson on, 2; authorship of, 16, 45 sq.; versification of, 14 sq., 47, 73 sq., 77 sq.; literary quality of, 46, 61 sq., 78, 125; double-endings in, 46 sq.; Bradley on, 47 sq.; Mackail on, 47 sq.; Coleridge on, 48; Swinburne on, 48 sq.; pre-Shake-

pearean aspects, 50 sq. ; un-Shakepearean aspects of, 61 sq. ; use of, as a school classic, 63 ; defects of, 64 sq. ; the origination of, 66 sq. ; the anonymous play on, 72 ; evidences of adaptation in, 73 sq. ; rhymed matter in, 77 sq. ; Marlowe in, 83 sq., 125
RICHARD III, x, xii, 11, 20, 123
RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, 116, 118, 123
Ritson, cited, 2, 126
ROMEO AND JULIET, 5 ; rhymed matter in, 77, 78, 79
Roses scene, in 1 HENRY VI, 83 *n.*

S

Saintsbury, Prof., on RICHARD II, 50
Scansion, Elizabethan, 100 sq.
Schelling, Prof., 72, 129
Schoell, Prof., 197 *n.*
SELIMUS, 24 *n.*, 118
Seymour, E. H., cited, 127
Shakespeare, portraits of, xiv ; early versification of, 11 sq., 51, 65, 89, 91, 131 ; theory of his connection with Pembroke company, 21, 135, development of, 25, 91, 106 ; unenviousness of, 43 ; quotation in, 114 ; style of, 47, 51, 53, 63, 65, 74, 91, 104, 110, 114, 118, 121, 125, 138, 164, 189, 198, 205, 206 ; modesty of, 114, 116 ; sonnets of, 114 ; critical faculty of, 116 ; evolution of, 117 ; supremacy of, 43, 125, 204, 210 sq. ; parts played by, 155 ; theory of his legal knowledge, 157 ; humour of, 163 ; management of time by, 171 sq. ; handling of MEASURE FOR MEASURE by, 175 sq. ; his function of transmutation, 186, 196, 210 ; his vocabulary, xviii, 46, 196
Simpson, on the COMEDY OF ERRORS, 156
Singer, on the COMEDY OF ERRORS, 128
Smart, Chr., 10
Spedding, 128
Speed, character of, 6, 26
Steevens, on the prefaces to the Folio, xiii sq. ; on the ERRORS, 126, 127
Stevenson, style of, 115
Swinburne, on RICHARD II, 48, 49, 77, 112 ; on the Roses scene, 83 *n.*
Sykes, H. Dugdale, 59, 120, 135
Symons, A., on MEASURE FOR MEASURE, 159 sq.

T

Tags, Elizabethan, 29 sq.
Talbot scenes, in 1 HENRY VI, 78 sq.
TAMING OF A SHREW, THE, 135 sq.
TEMPEST, THE, xii, 4
Thomas, E., on Marlowe, 119
TIMON OF ATHENS, 165
TITUS ANDRONICUS, ix, xvi, 3, 11, 21, 30, 50, 116, 128, 138, 139
Tucker-Brooke, C. F., on Marlowe's translations, 94 sq.
TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA, THE, 1 sq. ; sources of, 4 ; versification of, 6, 11 sq., 16 sq., 22 sq., 28 ; theory of authorship of, 6 sq. ; double-endings in, 17, 24 sq. ; *gnomai* in, 2, 28 sq. ; clues to Greene in, 26 sq.
Tyrwhitt, on RICHARD II, 46, 67

U

Ulrici, 130 *n.*, 156
Upton, 1-2

V

VENUS AND ADONIS, 17, 18, 22, 30, 46, 49, 91
Verity, A. W., 56
Verplanck, 3, 128, 131
Versification tests, 11 sq., 18 sq., 22 sq., 46 sq., 51, 77 sq., 89 sq., 101, 129 sq., 130 sq., 134 sq., 188 sq., 204 sq.
Vocabulary clues, 35 sq., 91, 97 sq., 150 sq., 193 sq., 199 sq.

W

Ward, Sir A. W., on THE TAMING OF A SHREW, 136, 137
Wells, W., on JULIUS CÆSAR and RICHARD II, xvi sq.
Whetstone, 161
White, R. Grant, on THE TWO GENTLEMEN, 3 sq., 7 ; on RICHARD II, 50, 74 sq. ; on the COMEDY OF ERRORS, 126, 127 ; on MEASURE FOR MEASURE, 159 sq., 161 *n.*, 169, 170 sq., 174 *n.*
Wilson, J. Dover, on the " copy for the plays," xiii sq. ; on THE TWO GENTLEMEN, 6, 13 ; on THE COMEDY OF ERRORS, 126, 134 ; on MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING, 42 ; on MEASURE FOR MEASURE, 6 *n.*, 162 sq., 166 sq., 173, 177 sq., 191 sq. ; on THE TEMPEST, xii
WINTER'S TALE, A, 27

3 0081 013 344 555